

Benjamin F. Norwood  
Eben E. Smith  
Edwin D. McMorries  
Walter J. Pennell  
Guy B. McArthur  
John G. Powell

Raymond B. Storch  
Otto W. Grisier  
George D. Thompson  
Claude R. Riney  
Robert E. S. Kelley  
Lewis G. Jordan

## TO BE DENTAL SURGEONS

Clark E. Morrow  
Harold A. Daniels

## TO BE ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS

Wilbur N. Van Zile  
Stanley W. Smith  
Alfred F. White  
Joseph W. Campbell

James L. Townsend  
James J. Dempsey  
Joseph L. Parker

## TO BE PAY DIRECTOR

Duette W. Rose

## TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS

John K. Lynch  
George W. Bauernschmidt  
Austin S. Keeth  
Walter E. Gist  
Malcolm W. Pemberton  
Ralph J. Arnold  
John J. Jecklin

Julian J. Levasseur  
Joseph E. Wolowsky  
James B. Ricketts  
Francis M. Hook  
James J. Cunningham  
James R. Hanna

## TO BE ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS

Charles J. Naumilket  
Yates Stirling, 3d  
William A. Gerth  
Walter E. Fratzke  
John C. Bernet  
William L. Knickerbocker  
Byron C. Gwinn  
Donald S. Gordon  
Walter N. Gray  
Allan McL. Gray  
Milton C. Dickinson  
Albert P. Kohlhas, Jr.  
Jack Agnew  
Lee DeV. Boyle  
Hiram W. Spence  
Carlos M. Charneco  
Albert Konigsberg  
Hugh C. Haynsworth, Jr.  
George W. Foott, Jr.

Jesse S. McAfee  
Charles R. Almgren  
Carl A. Lizberg  
John F. Castree  
Bryant A. Chandler  
John W. Crumppacker  
John F. Just  
Robert M. Bowstrom  
Sidney A. Ernst  
Hugh L. Hendrick, Jr.  
George C. Hunter  
Thomas J. Montgomery  
Ralph M. Humes  
John C. DeWitt, Jr.  
Lawrence Smith  
Carl F. Faires, Jr.  
J. Harry Hayes  
Frederick O. Vaughan

## TO BE CHAPLAIN

Thomas F. Regan

## TO BE NAVAL CONSTRUCTORS

Alva B. Court  
Lew M. Atkins

Philip G. Lauman  
Ralph T. Hanson

## TO BE CHIEF ELECTRICIANS

William J. McPhee  
Elwood L. Knaus

## TO BE CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIAN

Clifton Evans, Jr.

## TO BE CHIEF MACHINISTS

Daniel Osburg  
Edward H. Brady  
Clarence L. Price

## TO BE CHIEF CARPENTER

Joseph T. Zumsteg

## TO BE CHIEF PAY CLERKS

Ollie Z. Whitt  
Inman F. Elliott

## POSTMASTERS

## ALABAMA

Albert H. Thompson, Rockford.

## CALIFORNIA

Walter L. Haley, Associated.  
Percy W. Helena, Los Altos.  
John H. Canning, Oxnard.

## FLORIDA

Avie L. Hansford, Altha.  
Douglass G. Perry, Avon Park.  
James A. Chadwick, Gainesville.  
John F. Yearty, Gulf Hammock.  
Chauncey Smith Daniel, Tavares.

## HAWAII

Arthur W. Carlson, Lanai City.  
Virginia S. Mathias, Waiakoa.

## IOWA

Kenneth F. Baldrige, Bloomfield.  
Wilford S. Smiley, Grinnell.  
Nelle Cullen, Sioux Rapids.

## MINNESOTA

Lloyd A. Ahles, Albany.  
Lindley B. Hanna, Austin.  
Edward E. Vig, Belgrade.  
Alfred Erickson, Bronson.  
Arthur Elmer Imsdahl, Brooten.  
Bertha H. Anderson, Byron.  
Lucy M. Berczyk, Clarissa.  
Olger B. Weibye, Eagle Bend.  
Herman Ten Cate, Edgerton.  
Virgia Poole, Effie.  
Norman O. Nelson, Fertile.  
Herman Frajola, Gilbert.  
Sam Bogen, Hendricks.  
LeRoy S. Burnett, Hewitt.  
Oscar A. Olson, Keewatin.  
Catherine G. T. Lydon, Kellogg.  
Herman H. Krenzke, Lewiston.  
Charles Mechura, Lonsdale.  
Jacob Egernan, Melrose.  
John R. Coan, Minneapolis.  
Russell C. Mills, Montevideo.  
Rudolph S. Viitala, Mountain Iron.  
John C. Christensen, Ruthton.  
Philip A. Weis, Sartell.  
William R. Kleven, Sebeka.  
George W. Phares, Sturgeon Lake.  
Alvi Hanord Auenson, Ulen.  
Elmer E. Swenson, Warren.  
Burt Mason, Warroad.  
Josephine D. Smith, Wayzata.

## MISSOURI

Emmett H. Bond, Osceola.

## OKLAHOMA

James R. Hankla, Geary.  
Tip J. Hammons, Hammon.  
James M. Crabtree, Weatherford.

## PUERTO RICO

Juan D. Rivera, Coamo.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Robert W. Evans, Cameron.  
George Allard Douglass, Whitmire.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Grace M. McGillivray, Garden City.  
George Kremer, Lesterville.

## WEST VIRGINIA

James A. Rowan, Kingston.  
Hugh V. Burt, Mannington.

## WYOMING

Alvah J. Macy, Moorcroft.  
Mayme A. Jackson, Osage.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Ever blessed Lord God, our Heavenly Father, we praise Thee for the abiding realities which are shown forth in Thy loving and ever-living providence; we therefore trust Thy perfect government and Thy glorious purpose. We ask Thee to manifest Thyself today by blessing us with grace and self-possession. These will sustain us in the severest trials and hold us from being swayed by vain and inordinate desire. We pray Thee to make us wise in our conceptions, firm in our convictions; grant that the purest instincts of our being may find full fruition in obedience to Thy holy laws. As we journey on through life's rugged way, may we glorify Thee in a faithful service to our fellow men. In the name of our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On January 21, 1936:

H. R. 1550. An act for the relief of Douglas B. Espy; and

H. R. 4799. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain officers and enlisted men or former officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as a result of the earthquake which occurred at Managua, Nicaragua, on March 31, 1931.

On January 24, 1936:

H. R. 1299. An act giving jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of the Cherokee Fuel Co.; and

H. R. 4436. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Alta Melvin and Tommy Melvin.

On January 27, 1936:

H. R. 6137. An act for the relief of the Otto Misch Co.

## COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have permission to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 6 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, permit me to say that during the last 3 days I have yielded time to 30 Members on this side of the House, who have made speeches; and about as many Members on the other side have made speeches. Besides that, 38 other Members obtained permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD. A hundred Members have got speeches in the RECORD during the last 3 days, and out of them all only two men even briefly referred to the bill that is before the House. If we are to conclude the Interior Department bill this week we have got to commence on it now, and even then we may have to sit on Saturday. I am in hopes we may adjourn over Saturday, but we absolutely must commence reading this bill if we are to pass it this week. The Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill is ready to be taken up next Monday. This is not the last opportunity there will be to make speeches. There will be ample time for additional general debate next week, and

the additional Members now desiring to speak can then be accommodated. I feel I must object to any further requests to address the House today, and confine discussion to the bill itself, and thereafter consider the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. CARPENTER. I merely ask the gentleman to withhold his objection for 6 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Four or five other Members will insist upon addressing the House this morning if I make an exception in the gentleman's case.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. The gentleman has no objection, of course, to Members asking permission to revise and extend their remarks?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Not at all; I have no objection to that; but when it comes to taking up more time on general debate after we have had 100 speeches in the last 3 days, I feel that the limit has been reached and that we should confine our discussion to this Interior Department appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I object.

GREAT DEMAND AND NEED FOR EXTENSION OF TITLE I, FEDERAL HOUSING ACT, ONE OF MOST SUCCESSFUL RECOVERY MEASURES

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, under the terms of the National Housing Act of June 1934, that portion of the statute known as title I expires on April 1, 1936. That is, that part of the act which authorizes the issuance of insurance for loans made for modernization purposes will cease on and after that date.

The act as originally passed placed the limitation of the life of this provision on January 1 of this year, and the amendment of May 28, 1935, extended the time to April 1, 1936.

By the terms of section 2 of the act the Administrator is authorized and empowered upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to insure banks, trust companies, personal finance companies, mortgage companies, building and loan associations, installment lending companies, and other such financial institutions, which are approved by him as eligible for credit insurance, against losses which they may sustain as a result of loans, advances, and purchase of obligations representing loans and advances of credit, made by them subsequent to the date of enactment of this act and prior to April 1, 1936, or such earlier date as the President may fix by proclamation, for the purpose of financing alterations, repairs, and improvements upon real property, and the purchase and installation of equipment and machinery on real property.

It was further provided that in no case shall insurance granted by the Administrator under this section to any such financial institution exceed 20 percent of the total amount of the loans, advances of credit, and purchases made by such financial institutions for such purposes; and the total liability incurred by the Administrator for such insurance shall in no case exceed in the aggregate \$200,000,000.

When the act was amended it was further provided that no insurance shall be granted under this section to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase by it, first, unless the obligation bears such interest, has such maturity, and contains such other terms, conditions, and restrictions as the Administrator shall prescribe; and, second, unless the amount of such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is not in excess of \$2,000, except that in the case of any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made for the purpose of such financing with respect to real property improved by or to be converted into apartment or multiple



family houses, hotels, office, business, or other commercial buildings, hospitals, orphanages, colleges, schools, or manufacturing or industrial plants, such insurance may be granted if the amount of the loan, advance of credit, or purchase is not in excess of \$50,000.

Under the authorization and empowerment of the act the Administrator has set up certain rules and regulations governing the issuance of insurance of notes held by financial institutions representing loans they have made for modernization purposes. In August of 1934, immediately after the plan had been placed in effect, the total of the insured notes amounted to a little more than a quarter of a million dollars—\$251,595, to be exact. In September of that year the total increased by more than \$3,000,000, reaching the sum of \$3,274,425. During the next month—October—this was nearly tripled. In the spring of last year there began a very pronounced increase in the volume of insured notes, showing the extent to which advantage was taken of this measure for home improvement and modernization, and for the equipment of commercial buildings and industrial plants, as its provisions became known.

In April of last year it had reached more than \$11,000,000, and it jumped more than \$3,000,000 to \$14,415,746 in May. Since then its increase has been marked and steady, the peak being more than \$31,000,000 in November of last year, and there was an average in excess of \$29,000,000 for the last 4 months of 1935, until the total to and including January 4, 1936, was \$257,371,682, or more than a quarter of a billion dollars. More than \$225,000,000 of this amount represented the volume of business insured during the year 1935 under the provisions of title I of the National Housing Act. This is exclusive of a sum, slightly larger, representing the insurance of loans under title II, so that the aggregate of the insured business of the Federal Housing Administration to January 4, 1936, is in excess of \$517,000,000.

As of December 31, 1935, in Kansas, there were 4,309 modernization and repair notes insured under title I. Under title II, as of December 31, 1935, there were 2,293 Kansas mortgages selected for appraisal, with fees paid, in the amount of \$5,783,907. The 4,309 modernization and repair notes insured under title I in my State amounted to \$1,312,187.

There is no time limitation upon the provisions of title II, which covers the insurance of mortgage loans upon real property, but there is a limitation of \$2,000,000,000 in amount. This does not include the limitation of \$200,000,000 of liability on modernization insurance under title I. Thus, under the provisions of the law as it now stands, with slightly more than a quarter of a billion of dollars of insured modernization notes, the total amount of Government liability is only a little more than \$50,000,000, whereas the law fixes the limitation at two hundred million. Losses on insured loans have been negligible, only about thirteen one-hundredths of 1 percent, as a matter of fact, of the amount of the insured loans. You can readily see that the Government has been called upon for practically nothing under this liability. Mr. Speaker, this bespeaks the care and discretion with which these loans made by private financial institutions are insured. It has been the means of giving confidence to lending institutions that these loans, which are, in fact, character loans, would be secure and that their money advanced for the modernization and repair and improvement would be repaid.

The result is reflected in the manner in which this business has grown during the past 6 months as the knowledge of the advantages of the Federal Housing Administration's program has been disseminated among the people. It may be said to be fairly hitting its stride which, there is every reason to believe, will be maintained during the coming months of the spring season. The amount of needed modernization, repairs, and improvements to the homes of American citizens to bring them up to what we term American standards, runs into many billions of dollars, according to a survey made a little more than a year ago. A part of

this is being done without insurance, under the stimulus given to such undertakings by the activities of the Federal Housing Administration.

In more than 8,000 communities throughout the United States volunteer better-housing committees have been established through the aid and with the cooperation of the Federal Housing Administration, and these committees have acted to instill into the minds of home owners the necessity and desirability of home modernization and improvement. The amount has far exceeded a billion of dollars in work done and contracted for. This means that this vast sum of money has been placed in the channels of trade and industry for durable goods and the re-employment of tens of thousands of workers in the building and allied trades industries. It means that men and women have been taken off the relief rolls and placed on pay rolls.

In addition to the home modernization activities, vast improvements have also been made in commercial buildings, such as hospitals and so forth. This legislation has been the means of improving and increasing more kinds of businesses than one would imagine. Mr. H. G. Fischer, president of the H. G. Fischer & Co., Inc., Chicago, manufacturers of surgical and medical equipment, reports that Title I of the Federal Housing Act has been most beneficial in many ways to his corporation, the 300 families connected with the corporation, and their numerous customers. It has enabled them to enlarge their factory and office force and to increase the earnings of the members of their force by substantial bonuses based upon salaries or wages received.

Their salesmen have earned more commissions on account of the increased volume of sales they have enjoyed. It has enabled the users of the surgical and medical equipment—those engaged in the relief of human suffering—to purchase necessary modern, result-producing equipment at substantially lower finance or carrying charges than have heretofore been available, on terms more commensurate with their ability to pay and on a basis which largely enabled them to make their payments out of their increased income. This has enabled the customers of this manufacturing firm to not only serve their suffering patients more effectively, but to increase their own earnings. The benefits derived from title I of the Federal Housing Act will enable the H. G. Fischer & Co., as well as many, many other manufacturing firms in all lines of equipment, to remit to the Government a much larger amount in the form of income taxes.

It is highly desirable that this effort should be continued—that it should not lapse on April 1, when there is vast opportunity for this character of construction during the summer season. Its continuation means still further opening up of opportunity for idle capital for profitable and safe investment, and it means the improvement, repair, and modernization of American homes, increasing their real and substantial worth, as well as the comfort, convenience, and well-being of those who own them. Moreover, it means a continuance of employment for the workers, not only who supply materials, but for those who actually perform the labor of construction.

The trade publication *Domestic Engineering* (1900 Prairie Ave., Chicago), in its November 1935 issue, began a campaign to unite all business publications in the building industry back of a concerted movement for continuance of title I after April 1, 1936. Letters were sent editors and publishers of trade publications. Excerpts from their replies, as published in the November and December issues of *Domestic Engineering*, include:

Samuel O. Dunn, president, *American Builder & Building Age*.—"The program has undoubtedly done a great deal to improve conditions in the building industry and has been a stimulus to much-needed private construction and repairs."

F. P. Keeney, president, *American Artisan & Heating, Piping & Air Conditioning*.—"We believe that F. H. A. is one of the soundest measures advanced by the present administration to stimulate business."

A. L. Ford, managing editor, *The American Lumberman*.—"We believe it has been a real factor in increasing employ-



ment in the building trades, in creating business for manufacturers and dealers. We certainly are in favor of the continuance of the F. H. A."

Edwin A. Scott, president, Sheet Metal Worker.—" \* \* \* Nothing should be left undone to promote the continuance of F. H. A. beyond April 1."

S. B. Williams, editor, Electrical Contracting.—"With new residential construction just opening up, it would be a mistake for F. H. A. to be abandoned."

Bertram Caddle, director, Copper and Brass Research Association, is quoted in the New York Journal of Commerce on December 18 as saying:

If title I is continued, the small home owner, through increasing confidence, will be a forceful factor in causing \* \* \* a home-building and rehabilitation activity which has never been experienced before.

A. R. Herske, vice president and general manager of sales, American Radiator Co., is quoted in the Washington Star (Nov. 16, 1935) as saying that—

The continuation of F. H. A. beyond April 1 is without doubt most necessary if the construction industry is to contribute through its activities to any recurrence of what we formerly called prosperity.

An editorial in the American Builder and Building Age, in its December issue, under the caption of Two Years More at Least, says:

Not only every building industry man, but every business man in any line should join the campaign to extend the provisions of title I \* \* \* another 2 years.

The editorial says further that modernization in the past year and a half has been 75 percent talk and that in 1936 and 1937 it will become 75 percent orders and action, and declares the low-cost installment financing under F. H. A. regulations are "essential" to this program.

The American Roofer, in its December 1935 issue, editorially declares it seems "foolhardy" to scrap a program which has proven "so vastly beneficial", and just when it is "getting into stride."

Following is a list of some of the other leaders of building and allied industries who have endorsed the effort for a continuance of title I of the Federal Housing Act beyond April 1, 1936:

Frank Carnahan, secretary, National Retail Lumber Dealers Association.

H. M. Reed, president, Standard Sanitary Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh.

Don D. Smith, sales director, plumbing division, Briggs Manufacturing Co., Detroit.

Herman W. Steinkraus, vice president, Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.

C. H. Hall, assistant manager, Johns-Manville.

W. A. Scherff, manager, oil furnace sales, General Electric Air-Conditioning Department.

Wm. C. Groeniger, president, American Society of Sanitary Engineering.

Howard Myers, editor, The Architectural Forum.

L. E. Moffatt, editor, Electrical Merchandising.

Leod D. Becker, publisher, Fuel Oil.

C. H. B. Hotchkiss, editor, Heating and Ventilating.

Howard H. Bede of National Real Estate Journal.

Kenneth Reid, managing editor, Pencil Points.

Findley M. Torrence, editor, Wood Construction.

Mat H. Friedman, merchandising director, National Sheet Metal Contractor.

Henry S. Rosenthal, editor, American Building Association News.

Contractors, real-estate operators, carpenters, painters, home builders, architects, millmen, engineers, salesmen, floor layers, material dealers, and so forth, are unanimous in their acclaim of the benefits that have been derived from this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the building and construction industries and those that are allied with them represent the second largest number of industrial workers in the country, being exceeded only by those engaged in the agricultural industry. That these industries are overwhelmingly in favor of advancing the time limit on the provisions of this act is shown by the demand they are making upon Congress for extension. They are militant in their activities in this respect. The increased business that has been created by this worthy effort, amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, has afforded employ-

ment directly and indirectly to such a large number of people as to have caused other necessary National and State expenditures to be decreased. This has brought about the net result that the insured modernization loans of the Federal Housing Administration have, in the final analysis, not cost the taxpayer anything but have actually been a means of saving him large sums. Certainly, if there is anything that deserves our consideration, it is legislation of this nature, which provides such a great amount of business without the spending of vast sums of Government money.

#### SOCIAL-SECURITY BILL

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point two short letters written by myself, one to my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. McGROARTY], and the other to Mr. R. E. Clements, secretary of the national Townsend organization, being the only letters written by me to persons of national authority in the Townsend movement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to follow:

LETTER TO REPRESENTATIVE JOHN S. MCGROARTY

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 9, 1935.

HON. JOHN S. MCGROARTY,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MCGROARTY: I have your letter of April 4 regarding the pending social-security bill and your new Townsend plan bill.

The bill reported out by the Ways and Means Committee will, as you say, prove a serious disappointment to all sincere advocates of security for old age. We should unite to vote down a gag rule on the bill and amend it.

Your new old-age-pension bill has been very carefully read and analyzed by me, and I consider it a great improvement over the original bill. It is clearly drafted. It presents a plan. I don't see how a bill could be more clear and simple in its language. Your speech in the House on April 1 was an admirable appeal for its consideration.

I approve the change, cutting out persons having an income of more than \$2,400 per year and deducting from the pension the amount of income earned under \$2,400 per year. This will lighten the burden of the bill and these benefits can go to the millions who have no income whatever.

Another material change is that your new bill does not require the Government to pay a pension of \$200 per month, but instead gives the pensioner his or her pro rata of the tax collected up to \$200. This change, however, raises a question which must be considered with great care. The question is, that since pensioners will only get their pro rata of the tax collected, it may result in uncertainty as to just what the pension will be from month to month. Whatever the pension is, it ought to be fixed and certain.

The only feature of the bill I fear is the burden of taxation. Even a pension of \$50 per month paid to 8,000,000 people would involve new taxes of nearly \$5,000,000,000 per annum. In the Seventy-third Congress the Senate put an amendment in the revenue bill adding 10 percent to income taxes, just as your new bill proposes. The House voted it out. I voted for it. But the statistics showed that it would only add about \$55,000,000 of revenue. I would say that it would be a liberal estimate if we got \$100,000,000 from the increased income tax and the 2-percent levy on inheritance and gift taxes, in your bill. Therefore, nearly all of the tax burden would fall upon sales and services.

The real question is not whether I am in favor of your bill but whether I can stand up for a plan of taxation sufficient to finance it and get the backing of the people who will have to pay the tax.

I wish I could be assured that my people, when they know just what it will be, would back me up in voting a tax of \$5,000,000,000 a year. I am for the most liberal pension we can finance. I would like to see your bill brought out on the floor and thoroughly considered. I stand ready to help you get this done.

As you know, I helped get Dr. Townsend the use of the caucus room for the meeting at which he presented his plan, and I also signed the petition to take your first bill from the Ways and Means Committee and place it on the House Calendar.

I am taking the liberty of mailing a copy of this letter to several hundred of my constituents who have written me concerning the original bill.

With my kindest regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. MARTIN, M. C.

LETTER TO R. E. CLEMENTS, NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, OARP

PUEBLO, COLO., December 13, 1935.

MR. R. E. CLEMENTS,

National Headquarters, OARP,

Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CLEMENTS: I have your letter of December 3 regarding Townsend plan legislation.



I voted for the McGroarty bill, and have stated here in public meetings that I would do so again. I also signed the discharge petition on the second Townsend bill.

The first question—Are you in favor of the Townsend plan?—calls for more than a "yes" or "no" answer.

The first bill, H. R. 3977, was recognized by those in charge of it to be inadequate and in some material respects impracticable, and was superseded by H. R. 7154, which was a very great improvement.

The so-called McGroarty amendment, which was voted on in the House as a substitute for title 1 of the social-security bill, was in the nature of additional amendments to H. R. 7154. In my judgment these amendments still further improved the bill, but I think the debate indicated that it needed further revision. I think the bill ought to be placed in the hands of one or more highly competent attorneys aided by economic and tax experts and further revised.

That question of the chain stores escaping most of the transaction taxes, which would fall on the independents, will require very thorough consideration. The chain-store system could be quickly copied generally. It is known that the intermediaries in the holding-company structure can be taxed out of existence; that is, the system would dispense with them rather than pay the tax.

I am asked repeatedly if I am in favor of the Townsend plan by people whom I don't believe know what the Townsend plan is. If they think it is a mere matter of going to the bank and getting \$200 the 1st of every month, and ultimately learn, as they must, that it is a matter of levying and collecting the tax and prorating the proceeds, which may be far less, they may be no better satisfied in the long run with their leaders than they are now with their Congressmen.

The plan is very simple. It is a matter of levying a certain tax and distributing it to a certain well-defined class of people. The question is, How much can be raised by the tax? I am for all the pension that can be financed.

I hope to see you sometime this winter. I want to talk over some aspects of the Townsend movement in Colorado which has made it look to me like a Republican-controlled movement. I notice Dr. Townsend declares for a third party. I doubt whether this will be relished by this other movement which is hoping to elect Republican Congressmen from Colorado. My voting for the McGroarty amendment would not help me with these people. In fact, they have gone around to public meetings and said I voted against it when they knew to the contrary. The Republican Party is not even in favor of the very limited social-security bill, to say nothing of the Townsend plan.

No doubt the group which voted for the McGroarty amendment will confer at Washington.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. MARTIN, *Member of Congress.*

HON. SMITH W. PURDUM, FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL—A TRIBUTE TO AN EXECUTIVE IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a personal tribute to the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, Hon. Smith W. Purdum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, of all the virtues possessed by mortal man I think the greatest of these are true devotion to duty and undying loyalty, which, of course, should include one's work in life, his friends, family, and party faith. These admirable characteristics are exemplified by no one any better and more plainly than they are by Hon. Smith W. Purdum, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, a grand gentleman and one whom I am proud to call my friend. His very presence lends dignity and confidence to any situation, and upon meeting him for the first time one is immediately impressed by the genuine sincerity and humanness of the man. Behind dark, quiet eyes rests the brain of an able executive, and in the bosom of the man beats the heart of a kind and gracious gentleman. These are the qualities that Smith Purdum unconsciously and unintentionally displays, not on certain occasions but at all times, regardless of whether the occasion is momentous or casual.

The life of this great man, and he has every attribute of greatness, reads like the fascinating novels that children the length and breadth of this land know intimately—the Horatio Alger, Jr., books, and the adventures of the characters which this author so ably presented were little different from the adventures in life of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General of the United States.

The village of Darnestown, in Montgomery County, Md., welcomed a little stranger for the first time in 1877, and for many years Montgomery County felt the presence of the boy,

Smith Purdum. At the age of 21 he qualified himself for duty in the Postal Service as railway-mail clerk. His path was filled with the usual trials and tribulations that beset the path of young men trying desperately to make headway in our complicated scheme of things, plus many unusual ones which made his task all the harder. However, in spite of heart-breaking obstacles, he rose steadily in his chosen life's work and was appointed United States postal inspector before he was 30 years of age, a remarkable accomplishment then, and even now. When unusual and difficult assignments needed expert handling, it was always Smith Purdum who was called in for these special assignments, and he successfully continued in this capacity until the beginning of the World War, when he was given the signal honor of being appointed post-office inspector in charge of the Washington office. Among his duties in this connection, one of them was to safeguard and supervise the shipment of billions of dollars of Government securities, which were distributed to all parts of the country, and it is noteworthy that not one dollar's loss was ever recorded against the spotless record of this able executive during those difficult and trying times.

Smith Purdum's ability has long been recognized by the officials of the Post Office Department. However, because of his staunch party faith and affiliations, his true worth was not formally recognized until the beginning of the Democratic administration in 1933, at which time he was appointed Deputy Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, and the following year saw his promotion to Acting Fourth Assistant Postmaster General. His multitudinous duties include the supervision of the entire motor-vehicle service of the Department; supervision of all leases for Post Office and Federal buildings; he has full administration of 1,600 Federal buildings, as well as the equipment and supplies for these buildings; prepares all postal zoning and route maps; together with the shipping of all supplies used in the entire Postal Service in the United States.

It can be said truthfully and without prejudice, that General Purdum knows more about the administration and operation of the Postal Service than any other living man. As a matter of fact, our genial and most efficient Postmaster General Farley, upon appointing him as Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, had this to say:

Mr. Purdum has an unusually fine record of service in the Department. He is a man of the highest integrity and he possesses splendid executive ability. I am happy to give this much-deserved promotion to Mr. Purdum.

Devotion to duty obviously and ultimately has its own reward. Family and friends are the inspiration and serve as a guiding light. Loyalty, as well as party faith, oftentimes obstructs and slackens one's speed toward a chosen goal and dampens the ardor of all but the strongest. Success and the fulfillment of life's ideals cannot be kept from one inspired by such qualities, fostered and aided by the true devotion and faith of family and friends of one who first had faith in himself and who recognized the fact that victory is bound to come to him who rides under the banner of loyalty.

In my humility I am proud to salute a grand gentleman, a true friend, and an able executive—one who is small and yet so big; one who is meek, but never weak; one who loves and is loved in return, and may his memory in our heart ever burn.

The Government of the United States is fortunate in having such an executive in the greatest public-service organization in the world, and I congratulate the Postmaster General on having selected Smith Purdum as a general in the ranks of this mighty army of public servants.

#### NEW DEAL

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, those who view the New Deal with alarm because they see in it a frontal attack on privilege, an honest and determined effort to pro-



test the masses from exploitation and profiteering, and a determination to use every possible method in order to put all employable men and women to work, and to see that no one starves, are now charging this Democratic administration with having disregarded the party platform, drawn up and adopted in July 1932.

The charges come largely from the representatives of privilege and entrenched power who are determined to bring back to this country an administration that shall be servile to their wishes. Others making the attacks do so from personal ambition and the love of publicity.

The cry of "broken pledges" seems a good one to try on the people. It might be if our people could neither read nor reason. But to an intelligent electorate, such a cry is recognized as hot air, signifying nothing.

#### CRISIS INTELLIGENTLY MET

Let us look at the platform we Democrats are charged with having disregarded or violated. There are many planks in that platform. The first and second advocate a drastic curtailment of governmental expenditures and a balanced Budget. The national platforms of the two great parties regularly begin with two planks advocating a drastic curtailment of governmental expenditures and a balanced Budget. Those are sound planks, popular planks, drawn according to standard specifications. We all recognize their soundness. And we all know that only in times of depression, with the grave national emergency that confronted this country on March 4, 1933, there was an imperative need for enormous Government expenditures for relief and rehabilitation. Any administration that had dared to disregard that situation and to insist on retrenchment would have lost the confidence and the respect of every class of our citizens. We made an honest attempt to cut the recurring annual expenditures through the Economy Act, which was supported by both parties. Then we faced the situation and made appropriations for relief. And we entered upon a great program of useful and necessary public works—one which should have been started in 1929. Now, my friends, I wish you to take notice. The Democratic platform explicitly advocated both relief and public works and pledged the party to their support.

#### BANKING SYSTEM SAVED

Upon coming into office on March 4, 1933, the President found that the banks of the Nation had collapsed. All over the country banks had been failing; everywhere bank moratoriums were being declared. Panic was in the air; the people were in despair. With characteristic courage and promptitude the President declared a national bank moratorium. This prevented more failures and it stopped the panic. Just as rapidly as possible banks that were sound were reopened and the public was given Government assurance that funds deposited in them after their reopening would be safe. Those banks that were found to be temporarily embarrassed or worse were placed in the hands of conservators. With the aid of Government loans, these banks were rapidly rehabilitated and reopened. And just as soon as it was possible to frame a bill and pass it Congress guaranteed bank deposits. Was this in accordance with the Democratic platform? It was, as a specific plank in the platform advocated quicker methods of realizing on assets for the relief of depositors in closed banks and a more rigid supervision of national banks for the protection of depositors. Perhaps our critics will say we went beyond the specific recommendation of the platform when we guaranteed bank deposits. We did. And I, for one, am proud of it. But in doing this we were carrying out the spirit of the platform and of a particular plank of the platform. And we were doing it in the interest of the people.

Another measure put through in those early months was one divorcing commercial banks from investment banking, thus putting an end, until the Republican Party gets back to power—if it ever does—to the vicious and shameless exploitation of trusting depositors by the sale to them of securities in which the banks were themselves interested and from the sale of which they made huge and dishonest

profits. That, too, was in accordance with the platform. Look it up.

At that same special session of the Seventy-third Congress we redeemed those platform pledges which advocated the saving of farms and homes; the conservation, development, and use of the Nation's water power in the public interest; and in the N. I. R. A. we boldly put into law two planks—one advocating the spread of employment by a substantial reduction in the hours of labor and another advocating measures to prevent monopoly and unfair trade practices for the better protection of labor and the small producer and distributor. We took the most direct and effective way. It proved to be unconstitutional. We abandoned it.

In adopting the A. A. A. we were mindful of that plank which reads as follows:

Extension and development of farm cooperative movement and effective control of crop surpluses so that our farmers may have the full benefit of the domestic market.

And of the next, which advocates:

The enactment of every constitutional measure that will aid the farmers to receive for their basic farm commodities prices in excess of cost.

#### PUBLIC-WORKS PROMISE KEPT

In the second session of the Seventy-third Congress we made larger appropriations for public works and for relief in accordance with the platform; we passed a law empowering the President to make, under certain conditions and restrictions, reciprocal trade treaties, specifically advocated by the platform; and we continued our successful efforts to restore agriculture and thereby to restore business and employment throughout the Nation.

Two of the measures passed in the Seventy-third Congress that have been most bitterly criticized by those interests that think the public welfare is promoted by cheating and exploitation are the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934. And yet the platform specifically advocates both measures. The trouble with the disgruntled agents of the exploiters is that we did meticulously and honestly follow the platform instead of forgetting it and thus warding off the attacks now being prompted by Wall Street.

In November 1934 most Members of Congress went before the people and asked for their verdict on the New Deal. They endorsed it unmistakably and sent back to both branches of Congress a larger Democratic majority than before.

With this direct mandate of the people, we proceeded with our constructive and progressive program. Under the spirited and able leadership of our greatest liberal President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, we liberalized the Banking Act and brought the control of credit into the hands of an enlarged Federal Reserve Board appointed by the President and responsible to him and to Congress. We did not go far enough, but we went as far as the platform warranted and as public opinion approved. And we made permanent the guarantee of bank deposits.

#### EXPLOITERS CURTAILED

And then we deliberately redeemed a pledge of the platform that all who favor the exploitation of the many for the enrichment of the few; all who oppose just restraints on the predatory interests; and all reactionaries of every type and every party oppose and will continue to oppose with their last breath. That platform pledge reads thus:

We advocate regulation to the full extent of Federal power of holding companies which sell securities in interstate commerce.

And there, my friends, we got into trouble. For this threatened to put a stop to the biggest and most profitable and most outrageous and unconscionable racket this or any country has ever known. The holding company as it has developed in the United States and most especially in the utility field is a national disgrace. It has for its object unearned profits, resulting not from honest effort, but from dishonest methods protected by unjust laws. Through holding companies thousands of innocent investors have been cheated and ruined. Securities have been issued with little



or no value behind them and sold at high prices to widows and orphans, who were thereby ruined. I have not time today to go into this. It is not necessary, as every intelligent man in this House knows the facts. The Insull operations are typical of the worst practices. Unfortunately there are many other examples of fraud, corruption, and dishonor in utility holding companies.

We all knew that. We Democrats had plainly written the remedy in our platform. We passed the bill, in spite of the worst lobby that has ever attempted to thwart legislation in the interest of the people. And then every organization in the country dedicated to the continuation of fraudulent practices in business, dedicated to exploitation and profiteering, began the attack. That attack, my friends, has not subsided. It will not subside. Even after next November 3, when Franklin D. Roosevelt has been reelected by the largest majority ever given a Presidential candidate, it will not subside. For these piratical despoilers of the investing public and of the consuming public have taken for their slogan: "Rule or ruin." They will never rest until they again own and run the United States Government.

#### PLATFORM PLEDGES KEPT

I have shown that it is not true that this Democratic administration has failed to keep the solemn pledges of the platform. And I have indicated why the attack is made on the administration on that false charge. The opposition, Mr. Speaker, simply does not dare to face the facts and to attack us for the progressive measures we have passed in the interest of the people. It does not dare come out in the open and attack us, because we have kept our platform pledges and have striven, in the words of that platform, to maintain and promote "the continuous responsibility of government for human welfare."

We have seen that the main planks of our platform advocated relief and public works, rehabilitation of the banks for the protection of depositors, the divorcing of commercial and investment banking, the saving of farms and homes through Government loans, the development of the Nation's water power in the public interest, the shortening of the work day and week, the passage of measures to prevent unfair trade practices and to protect labor, the control of farm surpluses and the enactment of measures to promote fair prices for farm products, reciprocal trade treaties, protection of the investing public through a securities act, and the control of holding companies.

Every one of these pledges has been redeemed. And yet we are accused of having forgotten the platform. It is not we who have forgotten.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a letter received by me from a farmer in my district who writes about the Constitution.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say to the membership of the House that requests from Members to publish in the RECORD something sent them by constituents are becoming more frequent. It is not my desire, nor am I attempting to withhold from the Members the opportunity to publish anything, but it is the desire of the Joint Committee on Printing to keep the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a record of the proceedings of the House of Representatives. If Members do not read the letters to the House I do not think they should ask permission to insert them in the RECORD. I feel they should give some consideration to the fact that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a record of the proceedings of the House of Representatives and not a bulletin for everybody in the United States.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman admit that he consumes just about as much, if not more, time as any three Members here in the matter of colloquy which has nothing to do with legislative affairs?

LXXX—80

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to my friend, or any other Member of the House, speaking on any subject. All I am trying to do is to carry out my duty of protecting the character of the RECORD. I think, however, this is also the duty of all the Members of the House. If the gentleman would like the job, I would be happy to turn it over to him.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. No; the gentleman has that job; let him keep it.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### A BIG NAVY PROVIDES LITTLE DEFENSE

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] on January 23, 1936, at Washington, D. C., before a conference held under the auspices of the Women's National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by my colleague from Wisconsin, Hon. GERALD J. BOILEAU, before a conference held on January 23, 1936, at Washington, D. C., under the auspices of the Women's National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War:

Only a few years ago the principal nations of the world signed a solemn agreement known as the General Pact for the Renunciation of War, sometimes known as the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact. The United States Senate ratified this agreement on January 15, 1929, and in doing so agreed with the other principal nations of the world that war should no longer be resorted to for the purpose of settling international disputes. Today the very life of that agreement is being threatened in many parts of the world. The United States Government took the initiative in bringing the nations together in this agreement and, consequently, has the responsibility of urging its compliance upon the world at large. This does not mean that we should resort to war to enforce the provisions of the treaty outlawing war, but it means that we should by our every action give evidence of our intention to refrain from war. We must prove to the world that we propose to perform our part of the agreement.

Some of the nations who joined with us in this solemn agreement have violated its provisions by resorting to armed conflict for the purpose of settling international disputes. Such conduct on their part, however, does not justify us in scrapping the treaty as though it no longer announced a sound and enlightened principle. On the other hand, the threat of its continued violations should urge us on to greater efforts in behalf of its preservation.

While it is our duty as one of the world powers to urge that the conduct of nations should be such as will result in continued world peace, our greatest obligation to ourselves and to the entire world is to take such action as will prevent us from becoming engaged in armed conflict. While we pray for world peace, we must let it be known definitely that should our prayers be unanswered, that we, at least, will not become involved in settling disputes by barbaric and uncivilized methods.

During the closing days of the last session, the Congress of the United States enacted a temporary law designed for the purpose of preserving our neutrality in the event that war should break out in any part of the world. We realize that our insistence upon our traditional demand for freedom of the seas was largely responsible for our having become involved in two wars. In our neutrality law, we stated that we would no longer give protection to American ships if they persisted in flying the American flag while carrying arms and munitions of war to one or the other belligerent nation. We made it clear that in the future this Government would not permit its nationals to make profit out of war by supplying any nation with the arms and munitions with which to carry on the war. We declared it to be our policy to remain neutral in the event of hostilities, and we have attempted to lay down a course of conduct that will give us every possible protection against our becoming involved in such disputes. We have gone further than merely taking steps to maintain our neutrality. We have let it be known that we do not intend to profit from anyone else's misery—we will not permit our nationals to exploit the misfortunes of others by increasing our trade relations with warring nations.

The temporary neutrality law will expire on February 29 of this year, so it will be necessary for the Congress to act before that date if such a policy is to become permanent. Although there are slight differences of opinion as to detail among those who are advocating the enactment of new legislation, the Nation is almost unanimous in demanding that our policy of neutrality be continued. Without a doubt, Congress will immediately enact



a permanent neutrality law designed to prevent entangling commercial or financial relations with belligerents and to prevent American citizens and American ships from traveling in danger zones so as to obviate, so far as is humanly possible, tragic incidents such as have in the past inflamed public opinion to the point where the people permitted Congress to declare war.

It is not enough to renounce war and announce our neutrality. While we should prepare ourselves against any probable invasion of our territories, we must, nevertheless, give to the entire world concrete proof of the fact that we do not propose a war of aggression. We should retain such parts of our national-defense establishments as are necessary for the proper protection of our borders and possessions, but should eliminate from our defense establishments all such agencies and activities as are designed and primarily useful only for aggressive or foreign warfare. While we are talking peace and neutrality and attempting to urge our views upon the world, there is no possible justification for the tremendous expenditures we are making in order to strengthen our Navy.

In 1917 the men and women of the country were asked to lend their efforts to the cause of peace. They were told that the best way to have peace was to fight for peace. They were told that in order to outlaw war we must fight a war to end wars. The great masses of our people did not think for themselves but accepted the statements of national leaders at their face value, and millions of our young men entered into the military service of our country and went to war firmly believing that in doing so they were advancing the cause of peace. They fought a war firmly believing that in doing so they were definitely fighting for the principle that war should no longer be resorted to among civilized nations for the settlement of international disputes.

Our military forces and those of our allies were victorious in that war—at least the enemy was subdued and the spoils of war were distributed among the victors. Our share, however, has proved to be only the cancellation of billions of dollars of debts due us from those nations with whom we joined in that nightmare. In reality, however, history will not record a moral victory for us if, at some future time, we should again become involved in warfare.

While we are loudly proclaiming our intent to remain neutral in the event of any possible outbreak of hostilities, and at the same time urging the world at large to keep faith with the treaty outlawing war, we are actually spending more money in building up a war navy than ever before in the peacetime history of our country. During the present fiscal year we are spending approximately \$1,000,000,000 on our Army and our Navy, the large part of which is intended only to prepare us for aggressive warfare. The crying need of the present day is to reorganize our military establishments in conformity with our avowed intention of remaining at peace with the world so far as it is humanly possible for us to do so. We should make it clear that we are prepared to defend our borders against any possible invasion, but we should at the same time, by our every action, make it clear that we do not propose to again send our young manhood to fight a battle on foreign soil. We should prepare for national defense, but should eliminate from our policy the militaristic, imperialistic, unsound slogan: "The best defense is the offensive."

Unquestionably our present naval construction program is out of harmony with the wishes of our citizenship. The large Navy we are building is absolutely unnecessary from the standpoint of national defense. To continue with this program of increased naval armaments can be interpreted in no other way than that we expect to engage in warfare for purposes other than for the protection of American lives and property here in America. Throughout the ages history has recorded that a large navy is not needed to repel invasion. Nowhere in history is it recorded that troops have ever been landed from the seas upon hostile territory. No one seriously believes that a large navy is necessary in modern times to prevent foreign troops from landing on our shores, because other methods are used and are more effective in the protection of our harbors.

On January 9, 1932, Admiral Bristol, then Chief of Staff of the Navy, said: "I might state in addition to that, we do not contemplate devoting the fleet to the defense of harbors. We have harbor defenses by mines, fortifications, patrols, submarines, and aircraft. \* \* \* The modern idea of the United States, and one I think that prevails now, is that the fleet would not be there for the protection of the coasts."

Such eminent authority should convince us that from the standpoint of defending the continental United States or any of its possessions, land fortifications, mines, submarines, and aircraft, are the only practical and effective instruments, together with an adequate land force composed of a civilian army of men and women possessing the willingness to die, if need be, in defense of their homes and homeland. It is not necessary to have a large Regular Army for defense purposes, because the National Guard, the Organized Reserve, the men and women from all walks of life who would frown upon fighting another foreign war, would cheerfully give their lifeblood in defense of their country in a fight, not of aggression, but of self-defense.

Let me also remind you of a statement recently made by Lt. Comdr. L. D. Webb of the United States Navy in which he said: "History records no instance of major land fortifications having been reduced and captured by naval vessels."

Believing as I do, that a large navy would be ineffective from the standpoint of defending the continental United States or its possessions from invasion, and that the only way to accomplish this is through proper fortifications, mines, submarines, and air-

craft, there remain only two other possible uses for a navy that even slightly justify our tremendous expenditures for such purposes. One excuse offered by the big navy interests is that we need all of the battleships, cruisers and what nots to protect our commerce with foreign nations.

As a matter of fact Secretary Swanson of the Navy says that one of the purposes of a large navy is "to protect the broad maritime interests of the American people, including their foreign policies and commerce on the high seas." Even if it were not for the fact that it is a matter of general knowledge that a navy can destroy merchant ships but cannot protect them, we can eliminate this excuse for building battleships, cruisers, destroyers, etc., by formulating and enacting a strong neutrality policy that will prevent American ships from carrying cargoes in danger zones or to the ports of belligerent nations.

The only other claim that I have heard advanced in an effort to justify the building of our Navy up to treaty strength is that we should be prepared to strike first in a great offensive in the event of a declaration of war. Those who entertain this view oftentimes express it by saying, "The best defense is the offensive."

It might be well to refresh our recollection of some of the experiences that have been recorded in history. It will be recalled that in 907 A. D., 10,000 Russian vessels, carrying 400,000 men, under the command of Igor, son of Rurik, the Swedish adventurer, who first ruled Russia, sailed across the Black Sea to attack Constantinople, which then belonged to Greece. Efforts on the part of the Grecian emperor to buy off the invaders were unsuccessful, and it was necessary, therefore, to immediately organize such forces as were at his command to offer resistance to the would-be conquerors. Only 15 ships were available to defend the capital against the attack of these savage hordes, but the Greeks defended the city by the use of streams of flame which destroyed the Russian men and ships and sent Igor in retreat with less than a dozen remaining ships. This demonstrates that the size of the fleet does not predict the outcome of the battle.

We have also recorded in history the fate of the Spanish Armada, which was leisurely making its way up the English Channel and was met by a handful of privately owned British ships manned with patriots determined to resist the onslaught of the enemy, and who, finally, by sniping and other unorthodox methods, prevented the great armada from accomplishing its objective.

During the World War the British Fleet, under the command of Admirals Beatty and Jellicoe, was unable to score a victory over the German Fleet, which was only about one-half as large as the former.

Those who claim that we must be prepared to strike first seem to forget the fate of those large fleets in history which have attempted to attack the enemies' territories from the sea. With the development of submarines, mines, airplanes, and other modern war equipment, such an attack by us or upon us is positively doomed to failure.

It is possible that in time of war the two opposing fleets might encounter one another either accidentally or as a result of willful maneuvering on the part of their respective commanders. Would the outcome of such an encounter be predetermined because of the superior strength of either fleet, or would the outcome be purely a matter of chance? Is it not a matter of fact that a large fleet operating as one unit would be handicapped because of the lack of communication between various divisions and units of the fleet? Certainly no one believes that in any future war the admiral of the fleet will be able to give directions to the other component parts thereof by hoisting flags upon the flagship. This method of communication and the use of semaphore, wigwagging, blinkers, etc., have been made entirely useless through the development of smoke screens and other devices used to lessen visibility in time of battle.

Can we rely upon the radio as a means of directing the movements of all of the battleships, battle cruisers, cruisers, submarines, destroyers, and airplanes, which are all parts of our fleet? Obviously, we cannot rely upon the radio because every nation in the world that has experimented with the radio for use in such an emergency has developed methods of creating radio interference to prevent the enemy from using a method of communication they themselves hope to employ. Certainly, the art of creating interference has kept up with the art of radio communication. In peacetimes we have enough trouble with interference with radio reception when everything possible is done to prevent such interference. If human ingenuity has not and cannot develop radio interference sufficient to prevent directing fleet operations by use of the radio, then certainly the tremendous number of radio channels that must be kept open to communicate with all of the various units of the fleet, on the water, beneath the water, and in the air, combined with similar activities on the part of the opposing fleet, would result in such confusion that it would be impossible for the admiral on the flagship to transmit orders that would be accurately received by his subordinates. One slight error might turn victory into defeat. There can be no practical means of communicating orders from the first ship in the fleet to others in modern warfare on the high seas.

The navies of the world have tried to be so efficient in preventing the enemy from recognizing them as such that they have employed means of identifying themselves through secret codes, which of necessity change so rapidly that mistakes are likely to happen and, as in the World War, ships are likely to fire upon members of their own fleet, believing them to be the foe, because they did not identify themselves soon enough or because the signal was improperly executed or received.



Modern navies are, as Mr. Wayne Francis Palmer, a former naval officer, has said, "deaf and dumb"; and, as Miss Jeannette Rankin has said, "also blind." After all, if we are to admit that naval forces cannot successfully attack harbors properly fortified for defense, it seems to me that a battle engaged in between opposing fleets would have little, if any, effect upon the outcome of a war. Such battles are not decisive. If we are to have foreign wars and are again to send the youth of our land across the high seas to fight in order to avenge some fancied wrong, or if we are to permit our flag to go in a battle to protect the money invested by American citizens in some other country, then, and then only, would a large navy be of any value to us. If we are to send soldiers on army transports to fight on foreign soil, we will need battleships and cruisers to convoy such troops. It is true that the benefit of such protection has been greatly exaggerated, but there may be something that can be said in favor of having a battleship escort the transports over the high seas. At least the knowledge that a battleship is somewhere on the other side of the horizon might give a little comfort to those on their way to battle and at least would not do any harm.

But we do not propose to have any foreign wars. No responsible citizen of our Republic would dare to tell the American people that we will again send troops across the ocean to fight a real or imaginary enemy of our country. We do not intend to become embroiled in the troubles of the Old World, and we have said in announcing our new policy of neutrality that should war break out there, that we would, under no circumstances, take a part in it. We must not break faith with those men who now lie in Flanders Field. They gave their lives believing that they were making the sacrifice in order to prevent future generations of American citizens from going through the hell that they experienced. We must not—we will not send our troops to fight in foreign lands, and if we adhere to this resolve—which is entirely within our own control—we will not need a large navy to convoy soldiers to foreign battlegrounds. We should reduce, rather than increase, the amount of money that we are spending on so-called national defense, and should discontinue such expenditures as are now being made to prepare us for a war at any other place than here in the United States of America.

It should be the policy of the United States to use the governmental powers of national defense for defense only, to refrain from maintaining or establishing agencies of warfare other than those necessary for defense, to fulfill the commitments of the General Peace Pact for the Renunciation of War by adjusting the military system of the Nation to the policy of such pact, to maintain a defense policy designed to defend the boundaries of the Nation against invasion, and to eliminate from the defense establishments such agencies and activities as are designed and primarily useful only for aggressive or foreign warfare. To that end and for the purpose of avoiding unnecessary expenditure of the taxpayers' money, we should unite the entire Army, Navy, and air force, under one department, to be known as the Department of National Defense. I have introduced in Congress a bill, known as H. R. 9134, which, if enacted into law, will reorganize our entire military establishments under one head for defensive purposes only. Such a law would result in a great saving of the taxpayers' money, and it would prove that we are sincere when we denounce war as a means of settling disputes among nations.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, may I say in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that I feel correspondence between a Member of Congress and his constituents can very properly be placed in the RECORD. The Senate has great latitude in this respect and prints newspaper articles and the like in the RECORD. I do not, however, feel that is necessary. I believe we are doing our duty, however, as Members of the House if we include that correspondence which is of vital importance to the American public.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to address the House on a question directed to the privileges of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his request.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, a practice has grown up here of permitting the records of the House to be removed from the custody of the House. The particular matter I wish to call attention to is the report of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which report was laid before the House on the 3d of January and ordered by the Speaker to be printed. On the 20th of January I directed attention to the fact that the report had not yet been filed in the document room. The same afternoon I received a wet-proof copy from the

Printer, which contained a statement that certain provisions of the report, as directed by law, were not to be printed. Attention was called to this fact and steps were taken to have the report properly printed. That was some 13 days ago, but the report has not yet been filed and made available to Members in printed form.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] is not speaking on a question of personal privilege or on a question of the privileges of the House. If there is a question of the privileges of the House involved, the gentleman must introduce a resolution, which resolution must state the question of the privileges of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. It is very clear that the gentleman's remarks are directed to a question which should be raised by either a motion or resolution. The Chair may say that on a previous occasion when this matter was brought before the House the Chair announced that he had ordered this report printed. Of course, there is nothing further that the Chair can do now, inasmuch as he has already ordered this report to be printed.

Mr. McLEAN. But the printing is being delayed by persons who are not connected with the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the point of order made by the gentleman from Mississippi is well taken.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10630) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, to be confined to the bill, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. DOUGHTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire in the presentation of this bill.

This is the fifteenth annual Interior Department appropriation bill that I have assisted in presenting to the House. As I recollect, this is the largest bill ever presented. It carries \$81,221,330.05, which is \$4,179,754.05 more than last year; but, notwithstanding that, it is \$1,721,111.70 less than the Budget recommended.

Mr. Chairman, the reason that the Interior Department appropriation bill continues to grow in amount each year is because many new activities are added to this Department every year. During the past 3 years 21 large activities have been added to the Interior Department. There are four new ones in this bill this year for the first time, which is one of the reasons for it being so much larger this year. The new activities are the Bituminous Coal Commission, the War Minerals Relief Commission, the Petroleum Hot Oil Administration, and the Puerto Rican hurricane relief.

All of these items carry quite a large sum. The National Petroleum Coal Commission carries \$990,000 and the Petroleum Administration \$300,000, and so forth.

In this regular appropriation bill no appropriations for construction are included, with the exception of several items submitted in the Budget as a part of the public-works program but included in this measure because our Interior subcommittee is familiar with them. It is really a maintenance bill for the activities of the Interior Department,



which are scattered, as you all know, from the Arctic Circle to the Equator, a myriad of activities.

Consideration of the bill has required about 3 weeks of constant hearings. The volume containing our hearings is over 1,200 pages, the largest it has ever been for this Department. They contain, however, a full and frank justification for practically every item in the bill. We have required the bureaus to submit detailed statements of their activities, where they spent the money we gave them last year, and where they expect to spend it this coming year, and we feel if anyone will take the time to look at the hearings he will find a complete answer to anything he may desire to know about this bill, and for this reason I shall ask to be allowed to proceed without interruption and give you simply a few of the high spots on the bill itself.

I may say there is an item of net increase of \$850,000 for public works and \$400,000 for the Grazing Division. The item for the Grazing Division, under the so-called Taylor Grazing Act, is really not a large increase. It consists partly of \$68,000 transferred from the Geological Survey to the Grazing Division and \$250,000 is granted them only upon condition they collect it from the stockmen as grazing fees and pay it into the Treasury. If it is not paid into the Treasury, they do not get it.

Of the money they pay in as grazing fees on the public domain, 25 percent goes into the Treasury, 25 percent goes to the States for schools and roads, and 50 percent for improvement of the public domain. This gives funds for the destruction of predatory wild animals, to destroy a large amount of poisonous weeds that kill thousands of cattle every year, to improve the watering places on the range so that many of the cattle will not choke to death by the drought as they did last year, also build some necessary drift fences, and do many other things to improve the range. They do not herd on the public domain in the West. They turn out many millions of sheep and thousands of cattle and they guard the range they are put on, and in order to do this they have to build what are called "drift" fences. These drift fences prevent the stock from getting far out of their accustomed range.

We feel this activity is one that is going along as energetically and satisfactorily as can be expected, and it is being administered for very much less than the same amount of land is administered in the forest reserves.

The President's \$400,000,000 public-works program includes estimates amounting to \$26,600,000 for certain activities under the Interior Department. These are items which have been considered heretofore in this bill and for that reason they are put on this bill. However, they are continuations of present construction.

Three million five hundred thousand dollars is for Indian roads and trails. These are for the 100 or more Indian tribes, reservations, and agencies.

There is \$9,600,000 that is a continuation, and I understand a completion, of the Boulder Canyon Dam project.

There is \$6,500,000 for the all-American canal. This money is all obligated to be paid back to the Federal Treasury within 40 years, without interest, under the reclamation law.

There is \$250,000 for the construction of a new building over at the St. Elizabeths Insane Asylum. They asked for two buildings, but we only gave them one. We cut down the estimate \$250,000, because they are just completing a new building there that will take care of 300 additional patients, and this new building we are authorizing will take care of 160 more. So that 460 additional insane patients at St. Elizabeths Asylum will be taken care of. At the present time it is estimated the population will increase only about 100 next year, so that we feel this elimination can be made without hurting the institution.

As I have said, all of these projects, except the new building at the insane asylum, are continuations of projects that have been heretofore authorized by law.

We have eliminated a new section that was recommended by the Budget, authorizing an interchange of 10 percent of the total amount of appropriations among the bureaus of the Department. We felt that this was giving too wide a latitude, and for this reason we have eliminated it in this bill

with the understanding that the same action will be taken by the other nine subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. However, I may say in passing that within the bureaus themselves, in some instances, there is authority for such an exchange to the extent of 10 percent, and we feel it has been and is being wisely exercised.

In the office of the Secretary of the Interior there is an increase of \$400,000, but that is simply the \$400,000 I mentioned concerning the grazing item.

There is one item for the Mount Rushmore Memorial Commission for the carving on the mountains of South Dakota. We have hoped that that would come to a determination before this. They have nearly completed the carving of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, and they are now starting work on Lincoln. I understand the people doing this work hope to add to that a stone reproduction of President Theodore Roosevelt and possibly others.

I may say that these figures that are carved on the side of the mountain are costing the United States Government \$100,000 apiece, and we members of this subcommittee feel that is very expensive work to be carrying on in these times of depression.

However, it is expressly authorized by law, and we are obeying that law rather reluctantly. Congress passed a bill through the last session adding \$200,000 more for this work. Nevertheless, we have allowed only \$100,000 of that in this bill because we doubt either its wisdom or necessity.

We have put in a provision that no new figure shall be started that has not already been begun, because we felt that there would be no limit to the distinguished citizens that might have their figures carved on that mountain. I may say there are a lot of good mountains in my district that we could place carved figures on. [Laughter.] Anyhow, that is the action the committee took on the matter.

I should say further that when this performance was started it was distinctly provided that that State or private citizens would contribute an equal amount to be raised by the Commission. The Commission contributed \$96,000 and then quit. They requested a law relieving them from further contributions, and that was passed by Congress.

Now concerning the Petroleum Administration, we recommend \$300,000, which is \$200,000 less than was appropriated last year and \$50,000 less than the Budget.

The Chairman of the Petroleum Board made an investigation recently and Governor Scrugham checked up on that work, and the Chairman of the Board agreed that they could afford to take that cut.

For the Bituminous Coal Commission we have allowed the recommendations made by the Budget. They have set up quite elaborate machinery; they have five commissioners appointed, but there is no fund appropriated. Employees have been loaned from the Interior Department and the National Recovery Administration. The act provides for a set-up of 9 minimum-price areas and 24 district boards.

Concerning the General Land Office, we decreased that allowance \$112,000, and we made one little increase of \$15,000 for maps.

You know these large United States maps are splendid for schools of the country, and nearly every Congressman has had many requests for those maps.

They have run out, and the Budget did not recommend anything for any more. We have added \$15,000 to this bill to reproduce a large number of those maps. Under the allotment each Member of Congress will have 12 of those large United States maps allocated to him to use in such manner as he feels appropriate.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. That is not enough.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I know it is not enough. We ought to have 100 each for the schools of our districts. They are educational and are the most authentic and best United States maps published. They are entirely official. Two years ago the Budget declined to recommend any more money, but we added \$15,000 ourselves at that time and obtained a new allotment of these United States maps. They are economically printed and are splendid maps.

Concerning the Bureau of Indian Affairs, 44 pages of this bill are occupied with that Bureau. The bill itself is 116



pages long, the longest that we have ever had, and I imagine it is the longest that will be reported from any of the subcommittees this year. We have appropriated \$27,101,170.05 to the Indians, and that is \$1,086,509.95 less than the last year's appropriation, and \$1,413,061.70 less than the Budget recommended. There is a total appropriation also in addition to that out of tribal funds of \$1,507,820. The Wheeler-Howard Act was passed last year for the reorganization of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. That act has just been set up with a total appropriation of \$3,825,000. The estimates were \$3,675,000, and we have allowed \$2,140,000. A cut of \$1,520,000 in the estimate of \$2,500,000 for the revolving fund is responsible for that cut. They have not yet got started with all the machinery set up under the Wheeler-Howard bill. Under this amount that we have allowed, and in addition to what they have not expended, there is available \$3,480,000, which we feel is amply sufficient to get the work of the revolving fund started.

For industrial assistance to Indians, the amount recommended is \$2,283,000. Last year the appropriation was \$3,720,000. In other words, we have cut off \$1,437,000 less than last year's appropriation, and, as I say, \$1,492,000 less than the Budget. The cut of \$1,520,000 in the Wheeler-Howard item, to which I have referred, is responsible for this saving.

We have included an item of \$42,500 for development of what they call Indian arts and crafts. That is a new enterprise. The Budget recommended paying a man at the head of this new activity of arts and crafts, \$10,000 a year. Inasmuch as the Commissioner of Indian Affairs received only \$7,500 a year until about a year or two ago, when his salary was raised to \$8,000 a year, we thought it absolutely ridiculous to put some man under him to take charge of an activity under that Bureau and pay that man \$10,000, so we cut the amount down to \$7,500 and would not be surprised if somebody would cut it even less than that. The Budget allowed \$45,000, and we cut that amount \$2,500.

For education of the Indians we have appropriated \$9,295,375. Last year's appropriation was \$9,776,000. There is included \$981,000 in the appropriation of last year for cooperation with school districts in the construction of school buildings. This is an apparent decrease in education, but as a matter of fact there is an actual increase because of the amount of increased cost of operation and additional pupils and the depletion of tribal funds. A great many tribes have had funds of their own, but during this depression those funds have largely disappeared, and hereafter we are going to be compelled to appropriate more money for the Indians than we have been doing heretofore. There is no way of getting away from it. Two thousand one hundred and seventy-six pupils have been provided for in this bill over and above the number of pupils provided for last year. We allow so much per person ordinarily for pupils, but that varies in different localities.

For the conservation of the health of the Indians, the amount recommended was \$4,417,360. We gave them \$3,849,620 in the appropriation bill of last year. This is an increase of \$567,000, which is divided up in this way: \$374,150 for the operation of new public-works hospitals and for increased cost of operation of hospitals. We have quite a number of new hospitals, and we will have to have more. There is a large percent of tuberculosis and trachoma and other diseases of the Indians that we have to take care of if we are not going to permit the extermination of the red people in this country, and it costs a large amount of money. There is \$73,730 for the operation of hospitals that were formerly paid out of tribal funds.

Then they set up a new activity. We have allowed \$34,000 for what is known as pneumothorax clinics. They want to experiment among the Indians, and they have used this treatment among some colored people and others, and they have discovered what they think is going to be very beneficial treatment, and in many cases a substantial cure of tuberculosis, by closing up one lung at a time until that gets well and then opening that up and using it and closing up the other one. That may seem peculiar, but on page 1036 of the hearings you will find a very good description of that

proceeding, which they feel is going to be quite beneficial to the Indians.

We added an item of \$30,000 that was not recommended by the Budget. There are only a very, very few things that we put in here which were not recommended by the Budget. At Point Barrow, Alaska, the most northerly port of that whole country, away up above the Arctic Circle, nearly a thousand miles from any place on earth, the Presbyterian Church of this country has been maintaining a hospital for the Eskimos. There are about 1,700 Eskimos who live up there. That hospital has been maintained by the Presbyterian Church for many years. They built a building that cost \$50,000 and equipped it, and they have been taking care of those Eskimos. The building is on solid ice and it never melts. In the past year the number of patients treated there was over 2,847. The Presbyterian Church has absolutely got to quit.

They say they cannot stand that expense any longer. They have had a wonderful man up there in charge. He was a minister and he has been ministering to the welfare of these people in a religious as well as a medical way. He has become deaf. I think he is blind, too, and he is very old, and he has had to leave there. The Presbyterian Church wants to donate the whole property to the Federal Government without a cent of remuneration, but they say we must take it over. We made a study of it and we learned that we can carry that on for \$30,000 a year, so we put that item in this bill to carry on that hospital and improve it some and secure a competent physician and surgeon and at least one nurse, because whenever an Eskimo within a distance of 1,500 miles along that farthest northern country gets sick he must either die or go to this hospital.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. TABER. With reference to this all-American canal item, will the gentleman tell us whether or not this is the first time that has appeared in any appropriation bill?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; that is right. This is the first time it has appeared here. I might say the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget sent up an estimate to this committee for some new construction, additional construction, quite a large item, for reclamation. We decided not to put it in this bill and I decided not to put it in the deficiency bill that was passed last week, because I think that will more properly come in the first regular deficiency bill which we will take up very soon. That will be the first regular deficiency bill. We feel that that item of \$30,000 is a humane and very necessary item, and we put it in.

The amount recommended in this bill for the general support of the Indians is \$2,360,000. This is an increase of \$105,650 over last year. That increase is due to the depletion of tribal funds largely. It amounts to \$44,000. There is \$36,550 for additional clerical assistance. I may say that many of these Indian agencies do not have practically any help at all, and they must make a great many reports. We felt it was absolutely necessary to allow a few additional clerks at some of the Indian agencies, so that accounts for this item of \$36,000. Then we allowed an item of \$30,000 for the consolidation of the supervision of the Navajo and Pueblo Indians. Those are very large tribes and extend over a wide part of Arizona and New Mexico. This activity is authorized, and we felt it would be advantageous to give them that appropriation.

Under the Bureau of Reclamation we have added \$75,000 for the establishment of an operation and maintenance administration. I may say to the House that at the present time the Government has an investment of over a half billion dollars in these reclamation projects when those under construction are completed. I think it will be nearer \$750,000,000. This organization is necessary to look after that. I might say in passing—and I presume we will have some debate on this later on by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others—but every dollar of this money and every dollar of the appropriation that is coming in the next deficiency



bill, \$64,710,000, comes under the reclamation law. It is obligated to be paid back to the Government, dollar for dollar, within 40 years without interest.

Of course, it takes some machinery to look after it. But let me say as strongly as I possibly can that, considering all the Government reclamation projects up to this good hour, less than 2 percent of all the money that is now owed the Government of the United States is in default. There is no other large institution in the United States that can make as good a report as that. We do feel that the slurs and criticisms which have been made are not only wrong but are an outrage upon the people who are building up that vast western half of the United States, which Daniel Webster referred to as the great American desert, and making homes for thousands of people, making a market for every manufacturing concern in the United States which ships goods to it.

This Commission is also to advise settlers as to the most economic use of water, and so forth.

We made an increase of \$67,000 in the Geological Survey. I might say that we made a great many cuts, but there is a total increase of \$67,000. The amount recommended was \$2,352,560. The amount appropriated last year was \$2,285,560. This increase is \$40,000 for additional topographic surveys. We have very insistent demands upon us from all over the United States for topographic surveys, and we have allowed that item.

Then we have allowed \$38,000 for geological surveys. Fourteen thousand dollars additional for printing and binding; \$25,000 for mineral leasing on the public domain. We feel that all these matters are of tremendous importance, and we have assumed to make these appropriations, but they are still well within the recommendation of the Budget.

We have allowed \$50,000 for land classification, but that has been transferred from the Geological Survey over to the public grazing supervision to which I have referred heretofore, so that that is merely a transfer of funds. We have made a saving of \$10,000 in this item by reducing the estimates for mineral resources in Alaska. We felt that considering the large amount of money Alaska has obtained from the public-works fund, we could make this cut from \$70,000 to \$60,000. I may say in passing that I shall ask the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], who himself is a distinguished engineer, to answer any detailed questions there may be concerning the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey, which he is eminently qualified to answer. I will simply touch a few of the high spots.

The amount recommended for the Bureau of Mines is \$1,992,050. The appropriation last year was \$1,970,000. We made an increase of \$22,000 over last year's item, but we have eliminated \$20,000 from the estimate for the repair of one helium-gas well. There are four wells now in active operation. We felt, in view of the decreased demand for helium gas since the loss of the *Macon* and the *Akron*, that four wells were sufficient to supply all the helium we would need. We therefore made this slight reduction.

Other Budget items which we have denied are \$26,150 for demonstrations of mine explosions. We felt there was sufficient left without that and that they could very well stand this cut. We cut \$20,000 from the item "Testing of fuel." We have added \$12,000 for a survey of the stored oil in the United States. We have also added \$84,400 for experimental work at Boulder Dam with regard to the utilization of surplus power in testing ores and minerals in that area. I come now to the National Park Service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield only for a brief question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is there an appropriation for an investigation of the granite industry in the United States; the quarrying and distribution of granite? I understood that would be included in one of the items.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. At the moment I do not recall specifically. I would have to look over those items before I can answer definitely.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It might be included in one of the items?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I am not sure whether the Bureau of Mines would have authority over that. It would be a matter I would have to look into before I could answer the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand; but some might be obtained for this purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Possibly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right along this line?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Briefly; yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Ten thousand dollars is specifically set forth in the bill for a study of the occurrence of granite in the northeastern States.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman from Massachusetts, of course, understands there are something less than a million items provided for in this bill and it is impossible for me to remember all of them without checking up on them.

Coming to the National Park Service. Let me say that the amount recommended was \$16,022,080. We gave them \$15,871,390. This represents an increase of \$150,000 over last year's appropriation, but there is a decrease under the Budget of \$6,000. No individual park item has been increased. Of all the national parks in the United States we have not increased one.

The President has directed the Park Service to make an investigation as to whether or not charges or fees could be exacted by these parks to take care of some of the expense.

Mr. Chairman, in the matter of these national parks may I say that I think they are one of the outstanding important activities of this generation. Twenty years ago the total number of visitors to all our national parks was about 300,000 in a year. Last year, 1935, over 7,000,000 people visited our national parks. In other words, we are building up the sentiment "See America First." And millions of Americans are seeing America first. The people come to these parks from all over the United States, and in these parks are suitable accommodations for people with all kinds of means, or with scarcely any means. A man can put his family in a car and without much expense spend as much time as he wants in these parks. Really it is an investment in good citizenship and is a wonderful health-producing and invigorating service. I doubt the wisdom of charging the public much, if anything, for the use of the parks. They do make a nominal charge of \$1 a car or something of the kind partially for the purpose of keeping a tabulation on the traveling public. There is, of course, always some criticism by somebody about everything.

Speaking from long experience with these bureaus, I think the National Park Service in its showing, its justification, and the frankness with which it presents its claims to our committee is not exceeded or equaled by any other bureau of the Government. I feel it is a splendid organization and I have always been proud of them. It has always been a delight for me to be of service in upbuilding and improving our national parks.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield for a short question.

Mr. COLDEN. What portion of the expenses of the Park Service do these admission charges defray?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I have forgotten for the moment, but it is a comparatively small amount.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. For a question only; I want to proceed, I am taking too much time.

Mr. KRAMER. Does the gentleman know how it is that such companies as the Standard Oil Co., the Shell Oil Co., and others secure the right to sell gas in these parks? Does the Government receive any revenue from these concessions?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, when Mr. Mather was originally appointed—and I may say in passing that he is entitled, I think, to more credit for the creation of our National Park Service and for the enactment of the law which created our national parks than any other one human being. Soon after the passage of the law it was apparent that a definite system must be followed with re-



gard to the furnishing of service in these parks. It was felt it would be ruinous and disgraceful to let everybody run wild and make a racket of it. All the parks would have soon been ruined. After exhaustive consideration it was decided—and that policy has been carried out ever since—that they would grant exclusive concessions under strict regulations, strict supervision, and strict authority to cancel them whenever they were violated; and these regulations apply to all the parks. These concessions are let out to responsible parties. Some furnish food, some transportation, some sleeping quarters, some one thing and some another.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further.

So that we do have a definite system throughout these parks. They have what are called concessionaires or operators in each one of these parks who have practically a monopoly. Take, for instance, the national park in my own State. When the weather was fine if anybody came in on the train to Denver and wanted to go up to the Rocky Mountain National Park they would probably take them up there for \$5, but if the weather was bad they would be charged \$25 apiece. That became such a raw swindle that steps were taken to fix and limit the price. It is now fixed. The service is limited and everything about the matter is under the control of the Secretary of the Interior, and the charge is the same, rain or shine, and whether the bus carries 1 or 15 people. In other words, it is systematized. These contracts, of course, run a certain length of time for each concession. If anyone knows of any better system than that, and one which will any better protect the public, of course, I feel that the Secretary of the Interior and Director Cammerer would welcome the suggestion.

I must pass on now to the Bureau of Education. The amount recommended for the Bureau of Education was \$7,159,300. The amount appropriated in 1936 was \$5,761,220. We have given them an increase this year of \$1,398,080, which increase is due to the following items:

Five hundred thousand dollars is authorized by the act of June 29, 1935, and covers land-grant colleges throughout the United States.

Eight hundred and forty-one thousand dollars is an additional amount to cover vocational rehabilitation under the Social Security Act. This is one of the things that has been added on, and there is no way of getting away from it. It has been enacted into law, and we have to carry out that act.

There is an addition of \$20,000 added for the Hawaiian Islands and Puerto Rico. We have disallowed an item of \$50,000 in the estimate, due to the fact there will be an unexpended balance of at least that amount in connection with the vocational-education item. There is \$4,100 more disallowed due partly to the disallowance of traveling expenses. We reduced this item to \$2,300.

I come now to the Territory of Alaska. There was recommended a reduction in the 1936 appropriation of \$20,000 for construction of roads and trails. The sum of \$50,000 is cut from the Alaska Railroad item. I might say that a number of years ago before I became chairman of this subcommittee the Alaska Railroad was obtaining from a million to a million and a quarter a year in addition to all its receipts. During the first year I became chairman the item was cut in half to \$500,000; the next year we cut it to \$250,000, and the next year we cut it off altogether. But they came back and received a deficiency appropriation of \$250,000.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, that railroad cannot be run on its receipts for many reasons. One is the Richardson Highway competes with it. This is a broad highway and almost free. The trucks use this highway in the summertime, and, of course, most of the produces moves up there in the summertime, and people use the highway instead of the railroad. It was a very expensive railroad to build, having cost the Government \$57,000,000. There were hopes at the time of its construction that it would be self-supporting and might repay for itself, but that has not proven to be the case. We cannot very well abandon the

railroad because if we did we might as well abandon Alaska. The superintendent of that railroad, Colonel Olson is doing a splendid job. He deserves great credit. This railroad does take people from Seward to Fairbanks and it does maintain quite largely the morale and the business of the Territory. We therefore feel that \$200,000 is necessary and for this reason we have added that amount to the appropriation. We did cut off \$50,000 below last year.

The increases in Alaska consist of \$46,000 for the legislature. We pay the expenses of the legislatures in Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands. They meet every 2 years. They meet this year, so that we have this item of \$46,000 to take care of the legislature, and there is no way of getting away from that.

We have added \$11,600 for the care of the insane. I might say that the problem of the Alaskan insane is a very serious problem. The Morningside Hospital in Oregon has the contract at the present time to take care of the Alaska insane and have had it for a number of years, but the arrangement is not at all satisfactory. On the other hand, we advertised for bids and did not get a lower bid from a single hospital in the United States to do this work. We have to carry it on, and we will have to add a sum for the additional expenses involved in the care of the insane for the coming year. As I stated, the Morningside Hospital has a contract and they are taking care of these people at the present time. There is a large number of insane. Many of them I do not think ought to be there, but these people go to Alaska, they become insane, and then are shipped down there. We cannot throw them out. It is simply a humane matter.

We have added \$25,000 for repair of roads and trails.

Now, with reference to the Territory of Hawaii, we recommend \$68,650, an increase over the current year of \$47,000. This increase is necessary for the Hawaiian Legislature, just as was the case with the Alaskan Legislature.

Referring to the Virgin Islands, we recommend \$290,000, which is \$26,500 less than the current appropriation. An increase in the revenues of the municipal government permits this corresponding decrease, we feel.

The appropriation for St. Elizabeths Insane Asylum; the Columbia Institute for the Deaf; Howard University, the largest Negro university in the world; and Freedmen's Hospital are provided for in practically the same amounts as in the current year.

Mr. Chairman, this in a general way covers the high lights of the main activities of the Interior Department. As I stated, we have held exhaustive hearings. Our committee consists of seven members, and we feel that this report is eminently just. At the same time we have endeavored to save the Government some money.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Just for a question; not for argument.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield first to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I would like to ask the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], for whom I have the highest regard, and who, I believe, is better qualified to discuss this bill than any Member of the House—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. I would like to know whether moneys are going to be appropriated from Public Works funds to the Interior Department, as they were last year, which would naturally increase the amounts carried in this bill over what may be represented by the bill itself.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman will realize it is utterly impossible for this subcommittee to tell what the Public Works is going to give to any activity. I do not know what they will do, I am sure.

Mr. RICH. Last year when you submitted your report you knew there would be \$200,000,000 or more spent, and I thought perhaps the gentleman had the same information now.



Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; I anticipate they will get quite a good deal for some of these activities, but how much they will get I cannot tell.

Mr. RICH. This bill represents an increase of \$4,179,000 over what it was a year ago.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. RICH. And each appropriation bill that has been brought into the House up to this time has contained increases.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. We have had increased activities put on us that we did not ask for.

Mr. RICH. I am not criticizing the gentleman at all, but I want to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives the fact that every bill that comes in here carries an increase in appropriations. Now, we say we are going to try to balance the Budget, but if the membership of the House of Representatives is going to permit these additional authorizations as represented in every one of these bills that come to the House, then how can we ever expect to balance our Budget?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania in this way: As long as the House of Representatives and the Senate keep on passing an avalanche of bills by unanimous consent that create new charges and many large new appropriations, which ought not to be done, we are bound to obey the law and make larger appropriations.

Some of these bills are utterly unnecessary, but every week such bills are passed by unanimous consent; and they put more burdens on the Appropriations Committee and the Federal Treasury, because, when you pass a bill and the President signs it, you are authorizing and directing additional expenditures; this committee is obligated to appropriate the money to carry them out. That is how all this increase comes about.

Mr. RICH. Then it is the fault of the membership of the House of Representatives?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It is the fault of the House of Representatives and the Senate and the President. If we could cut out a lot of these bills that increase the charges on the Federal Treasury it would not put the burden on the Appropriations Committee of coming in here and asking the House to approve these increases.

Mr. RICH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I want to submit a parliamentary inquiry. How much additional time has the chairman of the subcommittee?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. May I at this time ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Colorado be extended 15 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the time for general debate has been fixed by the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Right in line with the suggestion that the gentleman from Colorado has just made with reference to passing bills by unanimous consent, carrying larger appropriations, does not the gentleman think this House made a very serious mistake in changing the Private Calendar rule, which enables committees to bring in and pass omnibus bills?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; I do.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman know that Tuesday afternoon the House agreed to a conference report on a private bill carrying \$900,000? The report was printed in the RECORD, but it was agreed to immediately. The report did not even go over under the rule, as unanimous consent was given for its immediate consideration.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. As long as the House and Senate shut their eyes and continue to pass bills which create large obligations on the Government, you will have

the Appropriations Committee coming in here with increased appropriations all the time.

Mr. RICH. And if we continue to make such appropriations, there is no man in the House on either side who is able to tell where you are going to get the money.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is true.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a table prepared by the Park Service and two letters, one addressed to the Bituminous Coal Commission, and the reply thereto.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have been trying to get a little time to talk here, and I have tried to get it on that side, and they will not give it to me over there, so I am going to object unless I can get a few minutes.

Mr. MILLARD. Object to what?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. To the unanimous-consent requests. Five minutes is all I have asked.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman—

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have a great regard for the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, both for him as an individual and for his ability, and I am happy to learn this morning that he is on the road to recovery and may be expected back with us in the very near future.

Last November I received a letter from the chairman stating that at a recent conference with the President it had been decided that this House should pass all appropriation bills, one legislative bill desired by the President, and then adjourn in the middle of March, or at the latest by the 1st of April. He added that as a result of this decision it would be necessary for the subcommittee in charge of this bill, and the subcommittee in charge of the independent offices bill, to meet simultaneously.

Needless to say, in spite of every consideration by the majority members of both subcommittees it was impossible for me to be in two places at the same time. Being assigned to both subcommittees, it was therefore necessary for me in reporting this bill to the full committee to make full reservation of rights on many items carried by the bill.

I want to speak this morning on a few features in the bill, and a few only, reserving such further comments as may seem advisable for the 5-minute rule.

First. As to the totals carried in the bill. For the fiscal year 1934 the appropriations carried in this bill amounted to about \$43,200,000. For 1935 the total rose to something less than \$46,900,000. Last year the bill carried about \$58,800,000. Deficiency items during the year brought the total up to \$77,000,000.

The present bill carries a total of over \$81,200,000, a reduction, to be sure, of over \$1,700,000 as compared with the Budget recommendations, but almost \$4,200,000 more than the bill for the present fiscal year and about \$38,000,000 in excess of the bill 3 years ago.

In addition there is an item of \$64,710,000 carried in the Budget for reclamation projects which has not been considered by this committee. If subsequently allowed through a deficiency bill, we shall have a total increase compared with the present fiscal year of \$69,000,000, with a total for the fiscal year 1937 of about \$103,000,000 as compared with \$43,000,000 3 years ago.

Furthermore, I have just been advised that the following emergency funds have been made available to the Interior Department under the present administration:

<i>Emergency funds allocated to the Interior Department</i>	
Public Works funds.....	\$193,148,028.95
Emergency Relief funds.....	129,583,372.00
Emergency conservation work, Indians.....	31,601,200.00
Total .....	354,332,600.95



The principal increases and decreases in this bill as compared with the present fiscal year are set forth in the report. If there is no objection, I will insert them at this point in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Increase in appropriations: As has been stated above, this bill appropriates a total is \$4,179,754.05 greater than the 1936 appropriation. The major increases are as follows:

Public-works program	\$850,000.00
Grazing control	400,000.00
Bituminous Coal Commission	990,000.00
Compensation to Indians for loss of lands	594,041.05
Conservation of health, Indians	567,740.00
Indian irrigation	129,464.00
Support of Indians	130,650.00
Operation, protection, and maintenance of public buildings, Park Service	1,086,900.00
Office of Education, including vocational education	1,398,080.00
Miscellaneous net increases	262,644.00
Total increase	6,409,519.05

The major decreases are as follows:

Petroleum Administration	\$200,000.00
General Land Office (surveying)	112,000.00
Indian industrial assistance (revolving fund)	1,437,020.00
Education of Indians	480,745.00
Total decrease	2,229,765.00
Net increase	4,179,754.05

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may mention in this connection that the increase of \$850,000 for the public-works program reflects an increase of about \$2,200,000 for reclamation, less reductions in respect to roads and trails in national parks and Indian reservations.

Before we finish discussion of the bill I hope someone will explain in detail the necessity for the four substantial increases under the Indian Service amounting to over \$1,400,000. The increase of \$400,000 for grazing control represents an increase of \$250,000 for the construction and maintenance of range improvements, dependent for expenditure upon the realization of grazing fees, plus an increase of \$150,000 for examination and classification of 80,000,000 acres of land under control of this agency. Of the latter sum, about \$68,000 represents a transfer from "Classifications of lands, Geological Survey."

The Members of the House will recall that in my remarks on the floor a year ago I suggested that before creating the office of Under Secretary of the Interior Congress was entitled to some showing of necessity in the matter. I pointed out at that time that we had never had until recently more than two Under Secretaries in the Government, one in the Department of State with representatives in every part of the world and one in the Treasury Department vitally affecting the lives of all American citizens. I pointed out at that time that there had been little or no showing of necessity made before either the House or Senate committees and that the Department of the Interior was not in a position to give any information as to the assignment of duties contemplated should the office be created.

The testimony of the Secretary of the Interior before the committee this year is to the effect that no reallocation of duties among the Assistant Secretaries of the Department had been made as a result of the appointment of an Under Secretary and that no duties had been assigned to the Under Secretary up to the date of the hearings other than special assignments from time to time.

We are all familiar, I think, with the character of those assignments. It seems to me that we are today in the same position as a year ago without justification for the creation or maintenance of this office.

The National Bituminous Coal Commission appears in the bill for the first time this year. It creates a little N. R. A. in the bituminous coal field pursuant to legislation enacted after receipt of the letter of the President in which he stated:

I hope your committee will not permit doubts as to constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation.

Almost a million dollars is provided for this activity, with strong indication of substantial increase in the event that the Court holds the legislation constitutional. The Commission is to operate through 23 district boards. It desires a total personnel of 310 with \$200,000 or thereabouts for a legal force of 80; with \$83,000 for a statistical force of 34; and with \$18,500 for an information and editing force of 9.

Section 14 (b) of the act creating the Commission reads as follows:

Each contract made by the United States, or any department or agency thereof, with a contractor for any public work or service, shall contain a provision that the contractor will buy no bituminous coal to use on or in the carrying out of such contract from any producer, except such producer be a member of the code set out in section 4 of this act as certified to by the National Bituminous Coal Commission.

Under authority already accorded, I insert at this point two letters, the first dated November 11, 1935, addressed to the Commission by the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, the second the reply of the Commission dated November 15, 1935:

CORRESPONDENCE RELATIVE TO INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF SECTION 14 (B) OF THE BITUMINOUS COAL CONSERVATION ACT IN RELATION TO GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
PROCUREMENT DIVISION,  
Washington, November 11, 1935.

CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL BITUMINOUS COAL COMMISSION,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Reference is made to the meeting on November 11, 1935, in this division of the representatives of the several departments of the Government designated to confer with the Director of Procurement with reference to general policies pertaining to contract procedure, at which meeting were present Messrs. Hosford, Tetlow, Ansell, and Hunt, of your Commission.

At the said meeting certain questions were presented relative to the effect of the Bituminous Coal Conservation Act of 1935 upon Government contracts, and the procedure to be followed in giving effect to the act. It was agreed that the departments and establishments of the Government should follow a uniform procedure, and that for the purpose of advising Government agencies thereof your Commission should be formally requested by this Division to decide the following questions in connection with section 14 of the act, which reads as follows:

"SEC. 14. (a) No bituminous coal shall be purchased by the United States, or any department or agency thereof, produced at any mine where the producer has not complied with the provisions of the code set out in section 4 of this act.

"(b) Each contract made by the United States, or any department or agency thereof, with a contractor for any public work, or service, shall contain a provision that the contractor will buy no bituminous coal to use on or in the carrying out of such contract from any producer except such producer be a member of the code set out in section 4 of this act as certified to by the National Bituminous Coal Commission."

1. Where a coal contract, which contains the provision required pursuant to section 14 (a) of the act, is with a dealer (not the producer), what are the obligations of the contracting officer and such contractor (dealer) with respect to the determination of the origin of the coal?

2. Where a contract contains the provision required by section 14 (b) of the act, and the contractor purchases coal from a dealer (not the producer) to use on or in the carrying out of such contract, what are the obligations of the contracting officer, the contractor, and the coal dealer, with respect to the determination of the origin of the coal?

3. Which contracts (if any) are excluded from the application of section 14 (b), which refers to each contract "for any public work, or service"? For example, shall the provision required by section 14 (b) be included in—

(a) All supply contracts, whether the items are from stock or manufactured especially for the Government under Government specifications.

(b) All leases of improved premises, regardless of the origin of the funds (Government appropriation or private contribution) from which the rent is payable.

(c) All contracts for service regardless of whether it is known to the contracting officer that bituminous coal will not be used on or in the carrying out of such contract.

4. Does the term "contractor for any public work, or service", in paragraph 14 (b), extend to subcontractors, etc.? If so, what are the obligations of the contracting officer, the contractor, subcontractor, etc., and dealers from whom they purchase coal, with respect to the determination of the origin of coal used on or in the carrying out of the principal contract?

5. What is the obligation of contracting officers, before awarding contracts, with respect to the determination as to whether the lowest responsible bidder has been, or is, in default (as to the coal provision) in the performance of other contracts with the United States, or any department or agency thereof?

6. What procedure is to be followed in cases where questions arise as to whether or not there have been violations of the contract provisions relative to the use of bituminous coal, and in



cases where it is evident to the contracting officer that there have been such violations?

7. Do cooperative agreements (Agricultural Department) come under the act? It is understood that such agreements are entered into with individuals, firms, and corporations and, conceivably, may be in the nature of public work or service. However, from the very nature of the agreement there is no profit accruing to the cooperator.

8. What should be the procedure where the contract is for telephone, electric, gas, and similar service, and the contractor, which controls the source of supply, refuses to include the coal provision in the contract?

Respectfully,

H. E. COLLINS,  
Acting Director of Procurement.

NOVEMBER 15, 1935.

ACTING DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT,

Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Your letter of November 11, 1935, addressed to the chairman, referring to the meeting on that day of the representatives of the several departments and other establishments of the Government designated to confer with the Director of Procurement with reference to general policies pertaining to contract procedure, at which meeting certain questions were raised relative to the applicability of the Bituminous Coal Conservation Act of 1935 to Government contracts, has been considered by the Commission.

Your letter stated that at the meeting it was agreed that the departments and establishments of the Government should follow a uniform procedure in applying the act to Government contracts, and that for this purpose the Commission should be requested by the Procurement Division to decide questions in connection with section 14 of the act.

The questions which your letter states are set out below in the order in which they appear in your letter and are answered as follows:

"1. Where a coal contract, which contains the provision required pursuant to section 14 (a) of the act, is with a dealer (not the producer), what are the obligations of the contracting officer and such contractor (dealer) with respect to the determination of the origin of the coal?"

Answer. The contracting officer must require the submission of evidence to him that all coal delivered under the contract by the dealer has been produced at a mine where the producer has complied with all the provisions of the code set out in section 4 of the act and promulgated by order of the Commission dated October 9, 1935. Satisfactory evidence of such compliance shall consist of (1) an affidavit executed by the dealer upon each delivery of coal setting forth the name of the producer thereof and (2) appearance of the name of such producer on the latest list of members of the code, issued by the Commission to the various departments and establishments of the Government. So far as the dealer's obligations are concerned, he is obviously under the duty to conform to the terms of the contract. The Commission is unable to advise you with reference to any obligations of the dealer existing outside the contract.

"2. Where a contract contains the provisions required by section 14 (b) of the act, and the contractor purchases coal from a dealer (not the producer) to use on or in the carrying out of such contract, what are the obligations of the contracting officer, the contractor, and the coal dealer, with respect to the determination of the origin of the coal?"

Answer. As in the answer to question 1, the contracting officer must require the submission of evidence to him that all coal delivered to the contractor by the dealer for use on or in the carrying out of such contract has been furnished by a producer who is a member of the code set out in section 4 of the act and promulgated by order of the Commission dated October 9, 1935. Satisfactory evidence of such membership shall consist of (1) an affidavit executed by the contractor upon each delivery of coal setting forth the name of the producer thereof and (2) an appearance of the name of such producer on the latest list of members of the code, issued by the Commission. So far as the contractor's and the dealer's obligations are concerned, they are under the duty to conform to the terms of their contracts. The Commission is unable to advise you with reference to any obligation of the contractor or of the dealer existing outside the contract.

"3. Which contracts (if any) are excluded from the application of section 14 (b) which refers to each contract 'for any public work or service'? For example, shall the provision required by section 14 (b) be included in:

"(a) All supply contracts, whether the items are from stock or manufactured especially for the Government under Government specifications.

"(b) All leases of improved premises, regardless of the origin of the funds (Government appropriation or private contribution) from which the rent is payable.

"(c) All contracts for service regardless of whether it is known to the contracting officer that bituminous coal will not be used on or in the carrying out of such contract."

Answer. The only construction which is consistent with the liberal and remedial purposes of section 14 (b) requires that that section be applied to every contract entered into by or on behalf of the Government. The transactions described in subquestions (a), (b), and (c) would therefore require the inclusion of the provision of section 14 (b).

"4. Does the term 'contractor for any public work or service', in paragraph 14 (b), extend to subcontractors, etc.? If so, what

are the obligations of the contracting officer, the contractor, subcontractor, etc., and dealers from whom they purchase coal, with respect to the determination of the origin of coal used on or in the carrying out of the principal contract?"

Answer. The term "contractor" as used in section 14 (b) applies to subcontractors. Accordingly, the obligation of the contractor under section 14 (b) extends to an obligation upon his part to require his subcontractor to buy no bituminous coal to use on or in the carrying out of the subcontract from any producer not a member of the code. So far as the obligations of the contracting officer, contractor, and subcontractor are concerned, the procedure set out in response to your questions 1 and 2, above, would appear to be sufficient.

"5. What is the obligation of contracting officers, before awarding contracts, with respect to the determination as to whether the lowest responsible bidder has been, or is, in default (as to the coal provision) in the performance of other contracts with the United States, or any department or agency thereof?"

Answer. If the name of the producer delivering coal to the contractor appears on the latest list of code members furnished by the Commission, the obligation of the contracting officer will be satisfied.

"6. What procedure is to be followed in cases where questions arise as to whether or not there have been violations of the contract provisions relative to the use of bituminous coal, and in cases where it is evident to the contracting officer that there have been such violations?"

Answer. The ultimate determination of the matter of violation is vested by the act exclusively in the Commission. Any question of violation of contract provisions required by the Coal Conservation Act of 1935 should be submitted to the Commission by the contracting officer or his proper superior. Provision should be made in each contract for the suspension of acceptance of performance in respect of the coal provisions thereunder until the Commission shall determine the fact of violation.

"7. Do cooperative agreements (Agricultural Department) come under the act? It is understood that such agreements are entered into with individuals, firms, and corporations, and, conceivably, may be in the nature of public work or service. However, from the very nature of the agreement there is no profit accruing to the cooperator."

Answer. The Commission is not now sufficiently informed in respect of the nature of "cooperative agreements (Agricultural Department)" to answer this question. It is suggested that a complete description of these transactions and of the authority therefor be submitted to the Commission so that it may undertake to respond to the question.

"8. What should be the procedure where the contract is for telephone, electric, gas, and similar service, and the contractor, which controls the source of supply, refuses to include the coal provision in the contract?"

Answer. The Commission can advise you in respect of such procedure only by reference to its answer to question 3 above.

Respectfully,

NATIONAL BITUMINOUS COAL COMMISSION,  
By C. F. HOSFORD, Jr., Chairman.

The Committee will note that while the act speaks of contracts for any "public work or service" and deals with purchases from a "producer" by a "contractor", nevertheless the Commission interprets the section as applicable to every contract entered into by or for the Government as including dealers as producers and subcontractors as contractors, even down to those furnishing incidental service, such as gas or electric light.

The interpretation of the Commission seems to me extreme, to say the least. The testimony of the Chairman before the subcommittee 1 month after the writing of this letter, appearing on page 126 of the hearings, suggests that he, too, has perhaps come to this conclusion.

Many of us have felt that this legislation was unconstitutional from the outset. Regardless, therefore, of the merit of the broad objectives of the legislation, over which there would perhaps be little difference of opinion, the question presents itself if the House should appropriate the sum of a million dollars prior to action by the Supreme Court, which no doubt will be forthcoming in the near future. The House having withheld only a few days ago the appropriation for the potato-control bill, it would seem to follow that similar action should be taken in this connection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice there is no appropriation for the Bituminous Coal Commission for 1936. Where did all the money come from to pay the expenses for this year?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There has been a deficiency appropriation, and my impression is there have been certain transfers during the present year to take care of the Commission until July 1 next.



The subject of reclamation has already been discussed and time does not permit of any detailed consideration on my part. In passing, however, I may emphasize the fact that the bill provides for an increase of about \$2,200,000 as compared with the present fiscal year, not including the sum of \$64,710,000 recommended by the Budget but not considered by the committee. The record indicates that some 70,000 new acres of land have been brought into cultivation, 45,000 under the Reclamation Service, 25,000 under the Indian Office, this despite the money expended under the A. A. A. with a view to taking land out of cultivation. The total investment of the Federal Government in reclamation projects is said to be

about \$250,000,000 in respect to those constructed and about \$250,000,000 in respect to those under construction.

The National Park Service is now entrusted in large measure with the operation, protection, and maintenance of public buildings, parks, and highways. The bill reflects an increase in this respect as compared with the present year of \$1,086,900.

Under leave already accorded, I shall insert at this point in my remarks a table prepared by the National Park Service showing a list of buildings in the District of Columbia leased wholly or in part by the Government.

*List of buildings in the District of Columbia leased wholly or in part by the Government, Jan. 11, 1936*

Building and address	Occupants	Net square feet	Annual rental	Rental per square foot	Date of acquisition	Contract no.
Adams, 1333 F St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Federal Emergency Relief Administration	850	\$1,200.00	\$1.41	July 1, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	Resettlement Administration	4,345	4,344.96	1.00	June 3, 1935	
Albee, 15th and G Sts. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Labor Department	384	480.00	1.25	Apr. 1, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	949	1,518.48	1.60	Nov. 1, 1934	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	351	561.80	1.60	July 7, 1934	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	4,851	7,761.60	1.60	Apr. 6, 1934	
Total <sup>1,2</sup>		6,535	10,321.88			
Albee, 15th and G Sts. NW	Bureau of Labor Statistics (Labor)	2,082	3,000.00	1.44	Dec. 16, 1935	
Appeals, 426 5th St. NW	Soil Conservation Service (Agriculture)	2,286	2,971.80	1.30	Nov. 26, 1935	
Arlington, 1025 Vermont Ave. NW. <sup>3</sup>	Resettlement Administration	54,696	63,500.04	1.16	Sept. 10, 1935	
Atlantic, 928 F St. NW. <sup>4</sup>	Forest Service (Agriculture)	38,337	30,000.00	.7825	July 1, 1934	
Barber & Ross, 11th and G Sts. NW. <sup>3,4</sup>	Federal Communications Commission	23,082	23,082.00	1.00	Nov. 1, 1935	I-lp-4908.
Barber & Ross warehouse, 4th and Bryant Sts. NE.	Resettlement Administration	8,824	3,100.00	.35	Nov. 18, 1935	
Do.	do.	2,952	900.00	.305	Dec. 18, 1935	
Total		11,776	4,000.00			
Barr, 910 17th St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2,037	3,720.00	1.826	Feb. 25, 1935	
Do.	do.	1,701	3,060.00	1.80	Oct. 1, 1935	
Total		3,738	6,780.00			
Barr, 910 17th St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Special Mexican Claims Commission	2,296	3,900.00	1.6986	Aug. 16, 1935	I-lp-4886.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	231	300.00	1.30	Sept. 1, 1935	I-lp-4893.
Total		2,527	4,200.00			
Barr, 910 17th St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Commerce Department	16,457	24,544.50	1.49	July 1, 1934	I-lp-2465.
Do.	do.	829	1,380.00	1.6646	Mar. 8, 1935	
Total <sup>3</sup>		17,286	25,924.50			
Barr, 910 17th St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	American Commission on Mexican Claims	1,000	1,490.04	1.49	Nov. 1, 1934	I-lp-2985.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	154	308.04	2.00	Dec. 4, 1935	I-lp-4912.
Total		1,154	1,798.08			
Barr, 910 17th St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Export-Import Bank	6,361	9,541.50	1.50	Nov. 1, 1935	I-lp-2465.
Bond, 14th St. and New York Ave. NW. <sup>1</sup>	National Park Service (Interior)	425	722.52	1.70	July 1, 1935	I-lp-3466.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	1,051	1,786.68	1.70	do.	I-lp-3468.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	1,852	3,075.36	1.66	May 15, 1935	I-lp-3406.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	3,236	4,900.56	1.5147	Feb. 1, 1935	I-lp-3385.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	1,735	2,613.96	1.5066	Mar. 15, 1935	I-lp-3388.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	5,319	7,437.49	1.3982875	Mar. 1, 1935	I-lp-2987.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	1,606	2,832.06	1.45	Jan. 18, 1935	I-lp-3382.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	245	342.48	1.398	Sept. 16, 1935	I-lp-4900.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	496	843.24	1.70	Oct. 4, 1935	I-lp-4899.
Total		15,965	24,554.35			
Bond, 14th St. and New York Ave. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Resettlement Administration	217	368.88	1.70	July 1, 1935	I-lp-3467.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	1,922	2,687.51	1.3982875	Mar. 15, 1935	I-lp-2987.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	770	1,211.70	1.574	Jan. 18, 1935	I-lp-3382.
Total		2,909	4,268.09			
Bragg, 12th and G Sts. NW. <sup>3</sup>	Bureau of Internal Revenue (Treasury)	1,490	999.96	.67	Oct. 15, 1935	I-lp-4902.
43, 45, 47, and 49 Capitol Court SW. <sup>3,4</sup>	Department of Agriculture	2,500	900.00	.36	Dec. 16, 1935	
Carpenters, 10th and K Sts. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Federal Power Commission	11,443	12,282.96	1.073	May 1, 1934	I-lp-3449.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	1,642	1,041.96	1.00	Aug. 1, 1934	I-lp-2470.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	1,729	2,161.20	1.25	Dec. 1, 1935	I-lp-4913.
Total		14,214	15,486.12			
Carry, 927 15th St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	National Bituminous Coal Commission	6,713	9,398.16	1.40	Oct. 16, 1935	I-lp-4901.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	756	1,058.40	1.40	Dec. 2, 1935	I-lp-4910.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	89	124.56	1.40	Dec. 19, 1935	I-lp.
Total		7,558	10,581.12			
Columbian, 416 5th St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Soil Conservation Service (Agriculture)	1,265	1,770.96	1.40	May 31, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	4,749	6,648.60	1.40	May 6, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	210	294.00	1.40	July 22, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	940	1,316.04	1.40	July 25, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	2,521	3,529.44	1.40	July 15, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	209	292.56	1.40	Aug. 21, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	372	520.80	1.40	Sept. 16, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	421	589.44	1.40	Sept. 12, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	404	565.56	1.40	Sept. 11, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	227	317.76	1.40	Nov. 2, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	204	285.60	1.40	Dec. 9, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	204	285.60	1.40	Dec. 23, 1935	
Total		11,726	16,416.36			

[Footnotes at end of table]



List of buildings in the District of Columbia leased wholly or in part by the Government, Jan. 11, 1936—Continued

Building and address	Occupants	Net square feet	Annual rental	Rental per square foot	Date of acquisition	Contract no.
Commercial National Bank, 14th and G Sts. NW. <sup>1</sup>	National Emergency Council	22,343	\$39,100.25	\$1.75	Jan. 1, 1935	
1108 Connecticut Ave. NW. <sup>3</sup>	Resettlement Administration	1,429	1,200.00	.839	Oct. 18, 1935	
Courts, 6th and Indiana Ave. NW. <sup>9</sup>	Department of Agriculture	5,373	8,400.00	1.56	Jan. 4, 1936	
119 D St. NE. <sup>13</sup>	General Accounting Office	35,688	40,187.55	.701	Dec. 27, 1933	
Do. <sup>13</sup>	Loans and Currency (Treasury)	21,610				
DeMott, 12th and G Sts. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Internal Revenue (Treasury)	15,243	15,243.00	1.00	May 18, 1934	I-lp-3450.
Denrike, 1010 Vermont Ave. NW. <sup>1</sup>	National Labor Relations Board	10,418	17,096.76	1.64	Sept. 10, 1935	
District National Bank, 1406 G St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Treasury Department	470	705.00	1.50	Aug. 16, 1935	
do.	do.	3,535	5,302.50	1.50	Apr. 15, 1935	
Total.		4,005	6,007.50			
801 E St. NW. <sup>334</sup>	Agricultural Adjustment Administration	20,424	18,000.00	0.881	Dec. 1, 1934	I-lp-2998.
1345 E St. NW. <sup>3</sup>	Bureau of Public Roads (Agriculture)	7,544	7,674.00	1.0172	Oct. 7, 1935	I-lp-4911.
Evans, 1420 New York Ave. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Bureau of Customs (Treasury)	5,234	5,233.92	1.00	Mar. 18, 1934	I-lp-3452.
Do.	Resettlement Administration	5,870	6,750.48	1.15	Dec. 5, 1935	
Evening Star, 11th St. and Pennsylvania Ave. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Federal Communications Commission	4,226	6,032.16	1.427	May 15, 1935	
920 F St., NW. <sup>4</sup>	Forest Service (Agriculture)	1,230	600.00	.4878	July 1, 1917	
1417-1419 F St. NW. <sup>334</sup>	Works Progress Administration	11,000	22,500.00	2.045	May 4, 1935	
1423 F St. NW. <sup>33</sup>	National Emergency Council	9,000	15,000.00	1.667	Apr. 25, 1935	
1724 F St. NW. <sup>331</sup>	Bureau of Census (Commerce)	39,872	24,592.00	.617	Feb. 1, 1935	
Federal Housing Administration, 1001 Vermont Ave. NW. <sup>31</sup>	Federal Housing Administration	100,414	155,000.00	1.5436	Jan. 24, 1935	
50 Florida Ave. NE	Alcohol Tax Unit (Treasury)	2,500	1,200.00	.48	July 1, 1934	
60 Florida Ave. NE. <sup>331</sup>	War Department	27,200	10,000.08	.367	May 12, 1935	I-lp-3455.
1328 G St. NW. <sup>33</sup>	Resettlement Administration	4,000	4,800.00	1.20	June 17, 1935	
Do. <sup>33</sup>	Works Progress Administration	8,536	6,000.00	.7029	Nov. 1, 1935	
1340 G St. NW. <sup>3</sup>	Works Progress Administration	8,360	13,749.96	1.64473	Sept. 1, 1935	
1342 G St. NW. <sup>3</sup>	do.	3,190	3,000.00	.94	July 1, 1935	
1712-1722 G St. NW. <sup>331</sup>	Shipping Board Bureau (Commerce)	72,938	53,000.04	.725	Feb. 1, 1935	I-lp-2979.
1415 H St. NW. <sup>7</sup>	Public Works Administration	6,347	6,000.00	.945	Mar. 4, 1935	
1510 H St. NW. <sup>4</sup>	Federal Housing Administration	8,738	9,611.76	1.10	July 8, 1935	
1825 H St. NW. <sup>331</sup>	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	150,867	132,474.96	.847	June 20, 1934	I-lp-2431.
Do. <sup>331</sup>	Commodity Credit Corporation	5,552				
Hill, 839 Seventeenth St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	14,958	22,267.56	1.48867	July 1, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	264	396.00	1.50	Nov. 2, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	522	783.00	1.50	Jan. 2, 1936	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	970	1,860.00	1.9175	do.	
Total.		16,714	25,306.56			
Hitz, 1106 Connecticut Ave. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7,163	9,000.00	1.256	July 1, 1935	
Hurley-Wright, 18th St. and Pennsylvania Ave. NW. <sup>133</sup>	Indian Office (Interior)	35,090				
Do. <sup>133</sup>	Bureau of Education (Interior)	30,069	57,000.00	.87478	July 5, 1933	I-lp-3442.
1004 I St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Forest Service (Agriculture)	489	1,000.00	2.045	July 1, 1929	
Investment, 15th and K Sts. NW. <sup>1</sup>	State Department	7,661	13,406.75	1.75	July 1, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	National Bituminous Coal Commission	4,277	7,484.76	1.75	Nov. 20, 1935	I-lp-4904.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	Commerce Department	5,143	9,000.00	1.75	Nov. 10, 1934	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	2,105	3,683.75	1.75	Feb. 1, 1934	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	667	1,167.25	1.75	Mar. 1, 1934	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	15,859	27,753.25	1.75	Jan. 16, 1934	
Total.		23,774	41,604.25			
2214 M St. NW. <sup>33</sup>	Resettlement Administration	9,317	6,960.00	.747	Dec. 10, 1935	
220 John Marshall Pl. NW. <sup>3</sup>	Resettlement Administration	3,350	1.00	.0003	Nov. 1, 1935	
1415 K St. NW.	Bureau of Public Roads (Agriculture)	5,374	8,061.00	1.50	Oct. 10, 1935	I-lp-4897.
1435 K St. NW. <sup>133</sup>	Panama Canal	15,000	15,000.00	1.00	July 1, 1935	I-lp-4887.
1518 K St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Rural Electrification Administration	7,144	11,414.40	1.60	Sept. 14, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	3,488	5,580.84	1.60	Nov. 15, 1935	
Total.		10,632	16,995.24			
Kellogg, 1416 F St. NW. <sup>4</sup>	Bureau of Public Roads (Agriculture)	4,715	6,129.50	1.30	June 1, 1935	I-lp-3405.
LaSalle, Connecticut Ave. and L St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Commerce Department	49,416	69,182.40	1.40	Jan. 5, 1935	
Leary Garage, 24th and M Sts. NW. <sup>133</sup>	War Department	53,000	15,000.00	.283	Aug. 1, 1935	I-lp-4868.
Lemon, 1729 New York Ave. NW. <sup>133</sup>	Petroleum Administrative Board (Interior)	10,677	8,840.04	.40230	July 1, 1928	I-lp-3453.
Lenox, 1523 L St. NW. <sup>31</sup>	Commerce Department	11,298	10,462.00	1.00	Mar. 21, 1934	
Lincoln, 514 10th St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Bureau of Internal Revenue (Treasury)	6,234	5,147.40	.8257	Oct. 19, 1934	I-lp-2991.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	4,674	3,859.32	.8257	Sept. 5, 1934	I-lp-2992.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	1,554	1,283.16	.8257	Jan. 9, 1935	I-lp-3377.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do.	1,476	295.20	.20	Feb. 4, 1935	I-lp-3379.
Total.		13,938	10,585.08			
2513 M St. NW. <sup>33</sup>	Department of Agriculture	2,200	1,000.00	.4545	July 2, 1917	
Marine Corps garage, 26th St. between E and F Sts. NW. <sup>3</sup>	U. S. Marine Corps	15,000	4,050.00	.27	July 1, 1932	
Maryland, 1410 H St. NW. <sup>4</sup>	Resettlement Administration	3,054	3,600.00	1.17878	June 26, 1935	
Do. <sup>4</sup>	do.	860	999.96	1.1627	Sept. 16, 1935	
Total.		3,914	4,599.96			
2000 Massachusetts Ave. NW. <sup>331</sup>	Rural Electrification Administration	11,956	15,750.00	1.568	May 18, 1935	
2020 Massachusetts Ave. NW. <sup>33</sup>	Resettlement Administration	19,242	19,242.00	1.00	July 22, 1935	
Mather, 916 G St. NW. <sup>4</sup>	do.	6,051	7,624.32	1.26	Sept. 17, 1935	
Do. <sup>4</sup>	do.	6,427	6,941.16	1.08	July 29, 1935	
Do. <sup>4</sup>	do.	11,842	12,789.36	1.08	June 4, 1935	
Total.		24,320	27,354.84			
Mather, 916 G St. NW. <sup>4</sup>	U. S. Employees' Compensation Commission	2,626	1,313.04	.50	Aug. 4, 1935	
Do. <sup>4</sup>	U. S. Civil Service Commission	1,045	1,201.80	1.15	July 22, 1935	I-lp-4881.
Do. <sup>4</sup>	do.	16,035	16,997.04	1.06	Aug. 28, 1934	I-lp-2974.
Total.		17,080	18,198.84			
McGill, 906 G St. NW. <sup>7</sup>	Bureau of Mines (Interior)	19,417	19,416.96	1.00	Mar. 1, 1934	I-lp-3448.
McKinley, American University <sup>333</sup>	Bureau of Chemistry and Soils (Agriculture)	65,633	12,800.00	1.9496	July 1, 1921	
McLean, 1500 I St. NW. <sup>33</sup>	Works Progress Administration	20,000	25,000.00	1.25	Sept. 15, 1935	
McReynolds Garage, Kansas Ave. and Upshur St. NW. <sup>133</sup>	Veterans' Administration	43,723	12,825.00	.2933	Sept. 16, 1933	I-lp-2425.
Mills, 17th St. and Pennsylvania Ave. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Turkish Claims Commission	837	1,200.00	1.541	Apr. 1, 1935	I-lp-3391.

[Footnotes at end of table]



List of buildings in the District of Columbia leased wholly or in part by the Government, Jan. 11, 1936—Continued

Building and address	Occupants	Net square feet	Annual rental	Rental per square foot	Date of acquisition	Contract no.
Moses, 11th and F Sts. NW. <sup>1,4</sup>	General Accounting Office	97,378	\$112,071.96	\$1.15	Aug. 23, 1935	I-p-4894.
Munsey, 1329 E St. NW.	Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration	2,994	7,500.00	2.505	Nov. 2, 1935	
National Press, 14th and F Sts. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Works Progress Administration	600	1,440.00	2.40	Aug. 16, 1935	
National Savings & Trust, 15th St. and New York Ave. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	31,807	54,071.90	1.70	Oct. 1, 1933	
National Union Building, 918 F St. NW. <sup>4</sup>	Resettlement Administration	1,192	1,609.20	1.35	Jan. 8, 1935	
1214 New Hampshire Ave. NW. <sup>1,2</sup>	U. S. Employment Service (Labor)	3,848	3,921.00	1.019	July 26, 1935	
	Forest Service (Agriculture)	528	696.00	1.32	July 1, 1934	
	Veterans' Administration	23,414	6,300.00	.269	Sept. 16, 1933	I-p-3434.
Octagon House, 1741 New York Ave. NW. <sup>4</sup>	Public Works Administration	593	560.39	.945	Mar. 4, 1935	
	do	590	557.55	.945	Jan. 26, 1935	
Total		1,183	1,117.94			
Otis, 810 18th St. NW. <sup>7</sup>	War Department	14,344	18,747.60	1.307	Dec. 15, 1933	I-p-4866.
Ouray, 801 G St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Resettlement Administration	17,567	22,385.16	1.275	Jan. 1, 1936	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	U. S. Employees' Compensation Commission	3,511	3,862.08	1.10	July 1, 1935	
1653 Pennsylvania Ave. NW. <sup>4</sup>	Indian Affairs (Interior)	652	734.86	1.12694	June 1, 1935	I-p.
Do. <sup>4</sup>	Soil Conservation Service (Agriculture)	2,636	2,755.20	1.045	Nov. 25, 1935	
1778 Pennsylvania Ave. NW. <sup>1,2</sup>	Securities and Exchange Commission	134,149				
Do. <sup>1,2</sup>	Bureau of Education Library (Interior)	9,027	118,149.96	.797	Nov. 10, 1934	P. B. P. 828
Do. <sup>1,2</sup>	Indian Affairs (Interior)	5,075				
Premier, 718 18th St. NW. <sup>1,2</sup>	Federal Trade Commission	17,600	25,143.00	1.4286	Dec. 21, 1935	I-p.
Printercraft, 930 H St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Federal Power Commission	8,085	7,276.44	.90	May 1, 1934	I-p-4865.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do	1,075	967.56	.90	Oct. 16, 1934	I-p-2983.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do	5,387	4,848.36	.90	Sept. 25, 1934	I-p-2978.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do	5,227	4,704.36	.90	June 11, 1934	I-p-2953.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do	8,744	9,618.40	1.10	Nov. 10, 1935	I-p.
Total		28,518	27,415.12			
Printercraft, 930 H St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Soil Conservation Service (Agriculture)	1,927	1,665.00	.864	Nov. 5, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do	6,628	6,627.96	1.00	Nov. 1, 1935	
Total		8,555	8,292.96			
Pythian, 12th and U Sts. NW.	Resettlement Administration	19,823	6,600.00	.333	Nov. 1, 1935	
Radcliffe, 907 16th St. NW. <sup>4,6</sup>	Prison Industries Reorganization Administration	5,115	6,420.00	1.255	do	
Rizik, 1737 L St. NW. <sup>2,6</sup>	Resettlement Administration	15,983	10,800.00	.6757	Oct. 15, 1935	
Rochambeau and Annex, 815 Connecticut Ave. NW. <sup>2,6</sup>	Federal Trade Commission	80,750	115,625.00	1.43	Jan. 6, 1936	I-p.
Shoreham, 15th and H Sts. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Federal Reserve Board	26,384	46,714.10	1.77	Mar. 1, 1934	
401 South Capitol St. <sup>5</sup>	National Park Service	55,080	26,680.75	.484	Aug. 10, 1935	I-p-4869.
South Capitol and Canal Sts. <sup>5</sup>	Resettlement Administration	39,253	22,029.84	.5612	Nov. 1, 1935	
Sparks Garage, 1126 21st St. NW. <sup>1,2,6</sup>	National Park Service	60,784	28,899.96	.475	Sept. 10, 1930	I-p-2420.
Standard Oil, 261 Constitution Ave. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Soil Conservation Service (Agriculture)	293	498.12	1.70	July 22, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do	998	1,696.56	1.70	Sept. 1, 1934	I-p-3383.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do	2,776	4,719.24	1.70	Feb. 4, 1935	I-p-3384.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do	12,507	21,261.96	1.70	Aug. 8, 1934	I-p-2982.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do	1,618	2,750.64	1.70	Oct. 5, 1934	I-p-2995.
Do. <sup>1</sup>	do	6,423	10,919.16	1.70	Mar. 30, 1935	I-p-3393.
Total		24,615	41,845.68			
Standard Oil, 261 Constitution Ave. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Home Owners' Loan Corporation	11,450	19,465.00	1.70	Nov. 9, 1933	
Tower, 14th and K Sts. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Electric Home and Farm Authority	3,723	6,031.32	1.62	Sept. 1, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	Bureau of Narcotics (Treasury)	14,022	23,838.30	1.70	July 1, 1935	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	Committee on Enrollment and Disbarment (Treasury)	2,412	3,907.44	1.62	do	
Do. <sup>1</sup>	Railroad Retirement Board	7,712	12,493.44	1.62	Sept. 24, 1934	
1212 V St. NW. <sup>6</sup>	Federal Emergency Relief Administration	6,000	2,880.00	.48	July 24, 1935	
1020 Vermont Ave. NW. <sup>6</sup>	Federal Housing Administration	3,693	5,650.32	1.53	Aug. 22, 1935	
1126 Vermont Court <sup>3</sup>	Panama Canal	13,631	1,800.00	.132	July 1, 1935	I-p-4880.
Victor, 724 9th St. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Forest Service (Agriculture)	18,219	17,153.03	.94	Aug. 16, 1933	
Walker-Johnson, 1734 New York Ave. NW. <sup>1,2,6</sup>	Works Progress Administration	84,047	50,000.00	.5949	June 13, 1934	
Washington Auditorium, 19th and E Sts. NW. <sup>1,2,6</sup>	Federal Emergency Relief Administration	70,000	50,000.00	.7143	June 9, 1936	
Washington Bldg., 15th St. and New York Ave. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Resettlement Administration	9,841	21,278.04	2.16	Aug. 3, 1935	
	Bureau of Customs (Treasury)	26,167	45,792.24	1.75	Mar. 12, 1934	I-p-3451.
	Federal Reserve Board	18,791	43,039.69	2.29	Aug. 4, 1934	
Washington Loan & Trust, 9th and F Sts. NW. <sup>1</sup>	Bureau of Mines (Interior)	15,698	19,622.52	1.25	Mar. 1, 1934	I-p-4885.
Willard, 513 14th St. NW. <sup>1,2,6</sup>	Bureau of Public Roads (Agriculture)	26,543	15,000.00	.565	Apr. 1, 1915	
1248 4th St. NE.	Resettlement Administration	1,000	2,400.00	2.40	Nov. 1, 1935	
826 7th St. NW.	do	10,683	11,000.04	1.03	Nov. 16, 1935	
1918 10th St. NW. <sup>4,6</sup>	Interstate Commerce Commission	39,000	26,500.00	.679	Jan. 1, 1936	I-p.
502 13th St. NW.	Soil Conservation Service (Agriculture)	1,400	2,100.00	1.50	July 1, 1935	
	do	1,400	2,100.00	1.50	July 17, 1935	
	do	1,195	1,922.04	1.6084	Sept. 23, 1935	
Total		3,995	6,122.04			
509 14th St. NW. <sup>1,2</sup>	Bureau of Public Roads (Agriculture)	6,540	6,000.00	.9174	Sept. 1, 1934	
821 15th St. NW. <sup>1,7</sup>	Resettlement Administration	10,446	12,500.04	1.20	June 15, 1935	
1200 15th St. NW.	U. S. Coast Guard, Treasury	13,364	33,283.60	2.49	Aug. 5, 1935	
532 17th St. NW. <sup>4</sup>	Federal Emergency Relief Administration	1,031	900.00	.8729	Mar. 25, 1935	
1503 21st St. NW. <sup>3,6</sup>	Resettlement Administration	5,500	3,863.52	.70	July 1, 1935	
501-513 26th St. NW. <sup>3</sup>	do	22,200	6,300.00	.28378	June 5, 1935	
510 26th St. NW. <sup>3</sup>	do	8,646	4,200.00	.486	Oct. 28, 1935	
517 26th St. NW. <sup>3,6</sup>	do	5,000	1,800.00	.34	Oct. 8, 1935	
Total		2,610,636	2,564,834.25			

<sup>1</sup> Fireproof, with fireproof protection equipment.<sup>2</sup> Space transferred from N. R. A. to Labor Department, Jan. 1, 1936.<sup>3</sup> Maintained by Government.<sup>4</sup> Nonfireproof, with fire-protection equipment.<sup>5</sup> Space transferred from N. R. A. to Commerce Department, Jan. 1, 1936; 16,457 square feet to be re-leased to Resettlement Administration.<sup>6</sup> Leased in entirety.<sup>7</sup> Fireproof, without fire-protection equipment.<sup>8</sup> Space transferred from N. R. A. to Commerce Department Jan. 1, 1936, to be vacated approximately Jan. 25; approximately 14,000 square feet of this space to be re-leased by the National Bituminous Coal Commission.<sup>9</sup> Space transferred from N. R. A. to Commerce Department Jan. 1, 1936.<sup>10</sup> Space transferred from N. R. A. to Commerce Department Jan. 1, 1936, and to be vacated approximately Jan. 15 and re-leased by the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Agriculture.



The Members of the House will note that over 40 private residences in addition to some 46 standard office buildings are included in the list, rent as high as \$2.50 per square foot being paid for some of these residences. As of December 1, 1932, the Government rented space in the District to the extent of 1,123,847 square feet. Today the figure is 2,610,636 square feet, calling for an annual expenditure of \$2,564,834.

Information as to space rented outside of the District is not available through the Park Service. I assume that when available it will show an equally striking expansion.

I hope that someone will tell the committee something of the Matanuska colonization project, giving some idea of the total expense involved in the undertaking and the chance of its success. From the Budget it appears that some \$671,500 is available out of emergency funds for the construction of roads to Matanuska or in the Matanuska Valley. This represents an expenditure of over \$4,000 per family on the basis of 166 out of 204 families said to have remained in the valley. Further expense is reflected in the furnishing of all the essentials of life which seem to have been made available to the colony.

Last year having been moving year, this year being clearing year, it will presumably be 3 years before, in terms of production, we can estimate the chances of success. The record indicates that the growing season is 120 days and that only 10 percent of the people in the colony have ever actually made a living on a farm at any time previously in their lives.

The testimony of Dr. Gruening, Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, indicates that the project is the beginning of a colonization program to be carried on during the next 5 years. Also, that the colony reflects the President's desire to get more people up there for various reasons, including military defense. I cannot but read this testimony in the light of the statement of the gentleman from Washington appearing in the hearings to the effect that he has been informed that one of the colonists sent to Matanuska had a wooden leg from the hip down, that several had bad cases of diabetes, that there was a case or two of pernicious anemia, and that several others were tubercular to the point where a couple of them had one lung just about entirely gone.

My time is limited, and I do not want to trespass on that of one or two of my colleagues who desire to speak on the bill this morning. I shall therefore confine the remainder of my remarks to the Office of Education.

Some of you have no doubt received a request from the Commissioner of Education for a list of so-called forums in your State or district. I confess that in spite of the testimony of the Commissioner in this connection I am still in doubt as to just what his definition of a "forum" is. The fact remains, however, that in his judgment the creation of forums throughout this Nation is a vital need in the field of education and that he would like to have appropriated a sum of, say, \$7,000,000 for the creation of forums over a period of 3 years. No money is carried in this bill for this purpose. I may point out, however, that about one-third of a million dollars is said to have been made available out of emergency funds for the creation of 10 of these forums in the near future on an experimental basis for a period of from 5 to 8 months. Confronted as we are with the possible expenditure during the next fiscal year of some \$11,700,000,000 and a possible deficit in the absence of drastically increased taxation or resort to unexpended balances amounting to over \$6,000,000,000, it does seem to me that this is one item that might properly be deferred until better times.

I turn now to the matter of vocational education, conducted under the supervision of the Office of Education, and wish to state that in my judgment the evidence indicates that there has been a totally inadequate supervision of vocational education programs in this country and the expenditure of Federal funds in that connection. I refer particularly to the so-called plant-training programs which have been set up in this country recently, particularly in some of

the Southern States. It appears that there have been many complaints directed at these vocational-training programs—complaints from organized labor, complaints from industry, complaints from other sources—and that as a result of these complaints in February last, just about a year ago, it was decided to conduct an investigation into the matter, one investigator being appointed by the Department of Labor, another being appointed by the Office of Education. These investigators conducted an investigation covering some 13 plant-training programs under public supervision and control, 7 day trade schools under similar control, and 3 plant-training programs supervised and financed entirely by the firms concerned. The investigation was limited to the garment and textile field, and a report was submitted on June 8 last. That report has never been made public.

Without going into detail, and without inferring that all of the elements I am going to speak of occurred in each instance, I may say that the report indicates, among other things, that all sorts of inducements have been held out to industrial plants to move into certain States, particularly in the South. These inducements have included the gift of factory buildings, the assurance of exemption from local and State taxation, the promise of labor trained partly at public cost, and the striking fact is that these plant-training schools to which I have referred, reimbursed out of State and Federal funds, under the Smith-Hughes Act, have been a definite feature in the inducements which have been offered.

Now, what have these plant-training programs amounted to? From the report it appears that the instructors in various instances have not been instructors at all in the accepted sense of the word. They have been foremen or managers or employees of less experience, from the firm for which the particular school has been operated. Students have been obtained locally and instructed in schools conducted in the plant of the firm for which they have been taught. Courses have consisted in the training for no more than a single operation in the course of the manufacturing process of the plant operating the school.

If we look at the question of wages, we find that the so-called students have been compelled to work for as much as 6 to 9 months at a time without receiving a single cent, and thereafter on a basis of partial payment only. Raw materials have been advanced by the firm interested, and the finished commodity has been offered in the general market in competition with legitimate enterprise in other States of the Union.

Mrs. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am glad to yield to my colleague from California.

Mrs. KAHN. Is it not a fact that there are no academic or cultural subjects taught, but purely mechanical subjects, and that many of the operators in these schools—because they are nothing but operators—are children, and that this is a way of avoiding the child-labor law?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I would say to my colleague that it is certainly true, in instances included in the report, that there has been no related instruction whatever.

Mrs. KAHN. It is merely a mechanical school, where they are taught the principles of this trade for a number of months, and their services are given free, and many of them are minors whose parents sign contracts, relieving the workmen's compensation act of responsibility in case of accident?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I cannot say to what extent the students have been minors.

Mrs. KAHN. But there are minors.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. But I do know that the report indicates that students at those schools have been required to sign exemptions from the applicable workmen's compensation act.

Mrs. KAHN. And the State of Mississippi has a number of cities in which a number of these training schools are being operated.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the impetus for these so-called training schools appears



to have come through State departments of education, local schools being used as disbursing agencies, pay rolls being advanced subject to reimbursement from State and Federal funds. Also that the investigators found that 10 out of 12 plants examined had moved during the last 2 years, 3 of them having operated previously with prison labor, 1 of them having moved out of the State of Connecticut, where it had experienced serious labor difficulty.

Mr. Chairman, the investigators who made the report to which I have referred concluded their report by stating that the conditions under which these plant-training programs were operated and the reasons given for promoting them suggest certain questions. Rather than take the time to read those questions, I ask unanimous consent to insert them in my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The questions suggested:

1. Can training solely on the repetitive performance of a single operation according to a method used in a single plant with the object of obtaining sufficient speed on production to become an asset to a company be classified as vocational education reimbursable under the Smith-Hughes Act?
2. What is the difference between "vocational training" given according to factory production methods with no related instruction and the initial training given any inexperienced worker on entrance to employment?
3. Is it sound public policy to use Federal money for reimbursing the salaries paid instructors of vocational education:
  - (1) When this instructor is a foreman engaged in production and instruction is only incidental to the job?
  - (2) When a mechanic engaged in installing and servicing machines is appointed as an instructor?
  - (3) When the funds are used to offset in part the fee of an industrial engineering firm by naming as a teacher an employee of that firm which is installing an efficient system of production?
4. Should persons who have had from 3 to 6 weeks experience in a plant-training program and no experience in a trade be considered eligible for appointment and temporary certification as vocational teachers when Federal approval of a State plan is contingent upon requiring 2 years or more of experience in the trade above apprenticeship level for a vocational teacher?
5. Has the Vocational Division of the Office of Education any responsibility for expenditures made by the State boards out of State funds appropriated by the legislatures for the same general purposes as the Federal funds and included in the annual reports?
6. Does the fact that Federal funds are not being used release the Federal Division of Vocational Education from all responsibility for maintaining educational standards in programs promoted by State departments administering grants in aid to State?
7. Have public-school officials administering a program of vocational education any responsibility for upholding the reputation for integrity accorded the public-school system by informing local school boards as to what vocational education is and the purpose of a vocational training school?
8. Can a plant-training school, where the superintendent of schools must request permission from the plant officials and the local chamber of commerce for authority to take an agent of the United States Office of Education into the training class, be considered under public supervision and control?
9. Under standard-line production an operative is normally trained to piece-rate standards in a period not to exceed 2 weeks. What justification is there for a public school prolonging such training for a period from 6 to 12 weeks?
10. Is a State supervisor of trade and industrial education under obligation to finance any training program requested by a taxpayer, provided an unexpended balance of State or Federal funds is available?
11. Since vocational education deals with the training of workers, should some provision be made in each State for the official representation of labor on the State board for vocational education?
12. Is the argument that persons are being taken off of relief and given jobs a valid reason for promoting and subsidizing the plant-training programs described in this report?
13. If the relief argument justifies a subsidy of a training program in a community which the industry is entering does the United States Government have any responsibility and official concern for the plight of the skilled workers thrown out of work in the community the industry left?
14. What training is a legitimate charge against industry on the one hand, and what training is a legitimate charge against the public-school funds on the other?
15. What can be done to coordinate the activities of the various Federal departments, so that one branch of the United States Government does not sanction practices which, in effect, assist in breaking down standards which have been established by other branches of the United States Government to eliminate unfair competition and to safeguard conditions of employment?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the report recommends a review of all the facts with a view to determin-

ing upon a national policy for the safeguarding of Federal grants in aid and the maintenance of acceptable standards in the application and promotion of educational programs.

I call the attention of the House in this connection to the views of Mr. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. Writing to the Commissioner of Education under date of November 5, 1935, Mr. Green stated, in part, as follows:

It seems to me that the Federal Board for Vocational Education should review the whole field of vocational training with a view to restating purposes and standards. \* \* \* It seems to me imperative that the reorganized Board for Vocational Education should set up some very definite standards for the expenditure of Federal funds. It does not seem to me that the Federal authority has assumed its full responsibility unless it provides the standard for guiding local projects in vocational education.

Mr. Chairman, I merely desire to state that I find myself in entire accord with the views expressed by Mr. Green in this connection.

Mr. Chairman, the report raises squarely the question of legality insofar as Federal funds have participated in these programs. The extent to which they have participated is not clear, but to the extent that they have participated in programs which do not fall within the proper definition of the term "vocational education", the participation seems to be clearly illegal and without justification.

The report also suggests the possibility of serious abuse in the use of vocational funds, in effect, as a subsidy to industrial plants in the South in competition with industrial plants throughout the Nation. It indicates the existence of intolerable conditions for the workers in those plants and resulting exploitation of labor. It raises squarely the whole question of the responsibility of the Federal Government for the safeguarding of grants in aid, and for the maintenance of proper standards for vocational programs.

I mention in passing, Mr. Chairman, that the Assistant Commissioner in charge of this work stated to the subcommittee that there were but four inspectors to supervise the Federal vocational education programs throughout this country; that they were physically unable to visit all the schools which are federally aided; that they visited one group one year and another group another year. Nevertheless, he went on to say that he felt—

That we are adequately complying with the provision in the act which states that we shall annually ascertain whether or not the States are using these funds in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What is the total number of people attending these schools throughout the United States?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am sorry I cannot give the gentleman detailed figures in that respect.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It would be very important to show whether they were a menace in certain States or not.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mrs. KAHN. It might be well to add that the report has not been published. It is very difficult to get a copy of it or even a sight of it. This report was made by Miss Burdick and Miss Scandrett, one from the Department of Labor, the other from the Office of Education. The report has not been published, but some who were fortunate enough to get a sight of it have been scandalized by its revelations, for it shows that this system is practically an exploitation of labor, an exploitation of child labor. I think the whole picture should be opened up, because I understand that factories have been induced to move from New England to the South; they have been assured they would be free of labor troubles, that their plants would not be unionized. In a number of instances where plants have had labor trouble they have come forward and offered to move them. They have been moved to Mississippi, particularly from the New England States. I think Willimantic, Conn., is one place from which a plant was moved to a location in Mississippi on account of labor trouble. I am sure the Office of Education, through its Division on



Vocational Training, even if it has not used Federal funds, has lent moral support to this type of vocational training where children and young people are brought into these factories for 6 long months and made to waive provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Their training is not broad; it involves one operation only.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is why we should find out the number of people involved.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But we have been making this appropriation for vocational training for many years.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The criticism I am making goes to the supervision and the application of funds.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We have been appropriating for this item for many years.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. We do not know how long this phase of it has been going on.

Mr. TABER. It does not reach back far enough to get into the preceding administration.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. If we should give them another \$600,000 maybe they would find a solution for the problem.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion may I say that I agree with the observation of my colleague, the gentlewoman from California.

Almost 8 months has elapsed since the submission of the report. Little or no action appears to have been taken. I see no reason why the report should not be made public with a full statement by the board of its future plans.

It seems to me the country is entitled to know what steps have been taken to meet the situation already brought to light in the garment and textile field; what steps, if any, are in contemplation to investigate conditions in other fields; what steps if any are proposed with a view to proper supervision in the future both of programs of education and of the expenditure of Federal funds. If the board is not prepared to act in the matter, affirmative action should be taken and taken promptly by the Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, in order that we may approach the consideration of this appropriation bill with a broad understanding and knowledge of its background, it is necessary to present certain pictures.

In his message to the Congress of the United States, delivered on the 3d day of January 1936, the President of the United States said:

In March 1933 I appealed to the Congress and to the people in a new effort to restore power to those to whom it rightfully belonged. The response to that appeal resulted in the writing of a new chapter in the history of popular government. You the Members of the legislative branch, and I, the Executive, contended for and established a new relationship between government and people.

What were the terms of that new relationship? They were an appeal from the clamor of many private and selfish interests, yes, even an appeal from the clamor of partisan interest, to the ideal of the public interest. Government became the representative and the trustee of the public interest. Our aim was to build upon essentially democratic institutions, seeking all the while the adjustment of burdens, the help of the needy, the protection of the weak, the liberation of the exploited, and the genuine protection of the people's property.

Soon after the advent of this administration on the 4th of March 1933, there was passed—and I believe the date was the 16th of June 1933—an appropriation bill calling for \$3,300,000,000. Those of you who were present at that time will recall that that appropriation was put through Congress on the representation that it was to be used for the relief of the needy and the distressed. Soon after that a large sum of money was allotted to what they called the P. W. A. under the direction of Harold L. Ickes, the Secretary of the Interior. A large allotment was made out of that fund for slum clearance in the city of New York, and a site was acquired from the property of Vincent Astor at the assessed valuation of that property—and everyone who knows anything about assessments on real estate knows that these assessments are at least 150 percent of what sales can be made for on the open market.

These particular properties had been vacant and unoccupied for a considerable period, and they had been unproductive. These properties were acquired from Vincent Astor on Third Avenue, between First and Third Streets, in New York City. The buildings were razed, large sums of money were spent in building buildings thereon, and these buildings are now rented at the rate of \$6 per month per room, which rentals barely pay the cost of the maintenance of these properties. And so this appropriation of \$3,300,000,000 passed by the Congress of the United States for the relief of the needy became an instrument for the relief of Vincent Astor, upon whose magnificent yacht, the *Nourmahal*, the President of the United States has been accustomed to consort with his rich friends. Thus the statement of the President in his message to the Congress of the United States is borne out, and we have a little sample of the administration of governmental affairs by Harold L. Ickes. That you may know a little more about the operations of this gentleman and the way he has handled the people's business, I desire to call attention to a bill which was presented in Congress from the Indian Affairs Committee, S. 1968, and a similar House bill, H. R. 6019.

Let me call to your attention the fact that on the 20th day of July 1931 the Secretary of the Interior under the administration of President Hoover presented to the President of the United States an appraisal covering certain Indian lands supposed to contain coal and on which it was claimed that the Ute Indians had a claim against the United States. This appraisal, made on the 20th of July 1931, amounted to \$62,165.75.

Under the administration of Harold L. Ickes a reappraisal of this land was submitted to the Committee on Indian Affairs boosting it to \$977,796, an increase of at least 17 times in the course of 2 years. This particular land was 65 miles from a railroad, where the grades ran up to 65 percent, and absolutely inaccessible. That bill made such an appeal to the House of Representatives that upon a roll call it was defeated to the everlasting credit of the Congress of the United States.

Let me tell you some of the things that have been done to the United States Treasury under the operations of this gentleman as Secretary of the Interior. In the fiscal year 1935 the appropriations for this Department amounted to \$60,464,000, but the expenditures, including allotments from the P. W. A., under Harold L. Ickes' control, totaled \$132,168,039.16. The appropriations made by Congress for the fiscal year 1936 for this Department totaled \$89,061,576, but the expenditures during that same period it is estimated by the Bureau of the Budget and the President in his Budget estimates, submitted to Congress on the 6th day of January, will amount to \$177,303,400. It will be noticed, Mr. Chairman, these expenditures are planned to run at least twice the amount of appropriations. The Budget estimates which were sent up here for this year amount to \$160,602,441. The estimates considered in this bill only amount to \$82,942,000, indicating that there is being held back and evidently will be followed by another bill covering the activities of this Department an amount of \$77,000,000 or \$78,000,000. I am not going into the details of the operation of the Interior Department at this time, because I have not the time. Let me say that millions upon millions of dollars of the three hundred-odd million waste that has gone on and the \$195,000,000 waste that is contemplated were for the development of reclamation projects, many of which were so rotten they had been turned down by Congress, most of which were nonproductive from the standpoint of honest mathematics, and all of which tended to put under cultivation acre upon acre of land to compete with that which belonged already to the farmers of America and creating a more distressing condition to the farmers.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The irrigation projects, to which the gentleman has raised an objection, are those irrigation projects that were started as a result of Executive orders and have not in any sense been authorized by the Congress of the United States?



Mr. TABER. That is the situation exactly, and in almost every case where there has been a project of that kind without authority of Congress it has been a bad project. This is what we would expect under the operations of Harold L. Ickes.

Mr. Chairman, that situation will never permit of agricultural recovery so long as it is continued. It is doing more damage to the cause of agriculture in America than any bill which could possibly be considered here in the House of Representatives would do good. I am just skimming over the tremendous figures that are presented in this bill, and, frankly, I am going to hit some of the details when the bill is being read for amendment. It ought to be enough to arouse the membership of this House to an understanding of their responsibilities in order that we may stop these terrific expenditures and point the way, not toward greater expenditures and greater taxes—and greater expenditures mean greater taxes—but toward lower expenditures and a balancing of the Budget of the people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the ranking member of the subcommittee [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, it seems to be the customary thing among members of these committees to compliment one another on the good work done, as well as the popular pastime of a small minority of this House to berate and deride most any committee, regardless of its efforts to cut expenses of government by charging a committee with reckless spending of money.

Let me say at the outset, that this subcommittee came to Washington a month before the convening of Congress. It began holding hearings on December 3 and held them almost continuously until January 14, when the last hearing was held.

It is only fair to say that each member of the subcommittee labored unselfishly in the task assigned, and the committee has presented a report that no member of the committee or of this House has any reason to be ashamed of.

The chairman of this subcommittee, the distinguished and able gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], a man whom every Member of this House, irrespective of politics, has the utmost confidence in, was on the job day in and day out. Although now far up into his 70's he has set a pace for work and perseverance that some of us 30 to 40 years younger found no easy task to follow. There is no question but what he knows more about the details of this bill than any other member of the subcommittee and personally I feel highly honored to be able to serve with him and under him.

It will not be my purpose at this time to answer the tirade of abuse that we have just heard on this floor from the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] against our distinguished and able Secretary of the Interior. The personal and official record of Harold Ickes needs no defense at my hands but I refuse to permit such uncalled for and unjustified tirade to go unchallenged.

It seems to be sort of a fad these days among some of the minority leaders and especially among some who think they are Republican leaders to stand in the well of this House and deride the President or any member of his official family. It simply happens to be Mr. Ickes today; but Harold Ickes is a patriotic American citizen who is rendering unselfish service to his country. Secretary Ickes recently took a little hide off the Liberty League that has now joined hands with the Republican Party and is a thorn in the flesh of the old stand-pat Republican crowd that almost wrecked and ruined this country. So, I presume that it is only natural that the gentleman from New York should vent his spleen and tear his hair as he rants against one of America's outstanding public servants, the Secretary of the Interior. [Applause.]

Now, my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] who, with his colleague from Kansas,

Mr. LAMBERTSON, rendered valuable service on this subcommittee, in his remarks this afternoon asked a fair question and I shall try in my limited time to answer it fairly and frankly. He has asked for someone to explain some of the major increases in the pending bill.

The outstanding increase is the general-support item for education. Your committee felt, after hearing all of the testimony, that these increases were justified. Not only did the committee feel justified in increasing the item for education, but it has also increased the items for agriculture and public health in the Indian Service.

Great strides have been made by the Indian Office under the supervision of Mr. A. C. Cooley, who, I believe, is director of extension work. I know at this time it is usually the customary procedure for someone to stand on the floor of this House and berate the Indian Office, from the Commissioner on down the line. I hold no brief for the Indian Office, but if Members of this House only knew of the splendid work being carried on by the Indian Office through Director Cooley, of the Extension Division, I am sure there would be no question about this important item for encouraging the Indians to become self-supporting. Indians are being taught to raise better cattle, hogs, sheep, chickens, and other things so necessary to the success of home life of the Indians as well as the whites who reside on the farms.

Your committee has also increased the item for the conservation of health among the Indians. The report plainly shows that a substantial increase in this item is due to the increase in hospital facilities that are being made available by public-works construction.

Another cause for increase in this health item is the fact that the Indian Office is making every possible effort to stamp out tuberculosis so prevalent among the various Indian tribes. Certainly no one will complain if this Congress renders every possible assistance in combating this dreaded disease that has taken such a toll of our people of all races within the past few years.

Much has been said today and probably more will be said about the increases in the items under the pending bill, but the fact remains that this committee brings you a report considerably below the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget.

In the Indian Service alone, there is a cut of over \$1,400,000 under the Budget estimates. And bear in mind, also, that this is over a million dollars under what was expended in the Indian Service during the current year. First and foremost, there is a decrease of \$1,520,000 in what is called the revolving-loan fund, created as you will recall, by an act of Congress known as the Wheeler-Howard Act.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman and will endeavor to be as brief as possible. As I just stated, this item, authorized under the Wheeler-Howard Act, has been cut \$1,520,000. The committee last year allowed \$2,500,000 under this item, but none of the money had been spent and few if any obligations had been incurred, and, therefore, the committee felt justified in cutting \$1,520,000 off of this item alone.

Now, let me call your attention to a little item some of you may have overlooked in the bill with respect to a research assistant asked for by the Indian Office and allowed by the Budget, amounting to only \$2,600. The committee eliminated this item for the reason it has been our experience that a research assistant whose business is to go through a department and reclassify the positions of the employees of the department, always manages to reclassify the positions upward. No one ever heard of one of them employed for such a task reclassifying the positions downward.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.



Mr. ZIONCHECK. If they reclassified them downward and kept going downward, where would they be when they got through?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No one expects such an assistant to reclassify positions downward, but the committee undoubtedly feels that the positions in the Indian Office, with very few exceptions, are comparable with positions in the other departments of the Government and therefore it was unwilling to invite a reclassification of all the positions in the Indian Office upward, as they believed would happen should this seemingly small item be allowed.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I think the gentleman misses my point. I meant if they reclassified them downward enough, it would get awfully hot for them and they would not like that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I understand the gentleman perfectly.

There is no money allowed in this bill for construction, except for improvements and repairs, but the bill reappropriates \$981,000 that was appropriated last year for the cooperation with county-school districts in the construction of school buildings.

There is a decrease in the item for roads and trails of \$500,000. We appropriated last year \$4,000,000 and this year only \$3,500,000.

Your committee cut the item for the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission from \$150,000, which was the Budget estimate, to \$100,000 and added a proviso that none of this amount shall be spent for work or projects not already started. I might add that I voted against the entire item in the committee, even though it has been authorized by Congress, I frankly do not think it can be justified at this time from any standpoint.

There is a decrease of \$100,000 for transportation of supplies in Indian Service and many other smaller items. May I again remind you that there is a total decrease in the Indian Bureau alone of \$1,413,000, which in my judgment, is a mighty good showing. If every department of the Government or if every subcommittee in Congress would bring in a decrease under the budget estimate at the same ratio that this committee has, and a decrease under what was actually expended last year, as this committee has in connection with the much abused Indian Office, the Congress would not be called upon now to raise additional taxes to carry on the functions of Government. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Is there any way under present conditions to reduce bureaucratic administration in Washington other than to reduce the appropriations for the various departments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I know of no other way, certainly, that is the most substantial way and a way that gets the job done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
SALARIES

Salaries: For the Secretary of the Interior, Under Secretary, First Assistant Secretary, Assistant Secretary, and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$392,970: *Provided*, That in expending appropriations or portions of appropriations, contained in this act, for the payment for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, with the exception of the First Assistant Secretary and the Assistant Secretary the average of the salaries of the total number of persons under any grade in any bureau, office, or other appropriation unit shall not at any time exceed the average of the compensation rates specified for the grade by such act, as amended, and in grades in which only one position is allocated the salary of such position shall not exceed the average of the compensation rates for the grade, except that in unusually meritorious cases of one position in a grade advances may be made to rates higher than the average of the compensation rates of the grade but not more often than once in any fiscal year and then only to the next higher rate: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply (1) to grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the clerical-mechanical service, or (2) to require the reduction in salary of any

person whose compensation was fixed, as of July 1, 1924, in accordance with the rules of section 6 of such act, (3) to require the reduction in salary of any person who is transferred from one position to another position in the same or different grade in the same or a different bureau, office, or other appropriation unit, (4) to prevent the payment of a salary under any grade at a rate higher than the maximum rate of the grade when such higher rate is permitted by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and is specifically authorized by other law, or (5) to reduce the compensation of any person in a grade in which only one position is allocated.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after the comma, at the end of line 5, strike out "\$392,970" and insert in lines 3 and 4 the words "Under Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "\$382,970."

And on page 3, after line 11, insert "*Provided*, No part of this appropriation shall be used for the salary of the Under Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a year ago, on representation to the Congress that it was absolutely necessary for the performance of the work of the office of the Secretary of the Interior, the Congress created, over the protest of some of us who thought it was unnecessary, the office of Under Secretary of the Interior. To date, as I understand, no duties have been assigned to the Under Secretary of the Interior, as no duties are performed by the Under Secretary of the Interior in the office of the Secretary of the Interior or in that Department.

Just so that the membership may have that information, I call attention to the testimony on page 9 of the hearings before the committee, as follows:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Has there been any reallocation of duties among the Assistant Secretaries of the Department as the result of the addition of an Under Secretary?

Secretary ICKES. No; there has not yet.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Do you contemplate such?

Secretary ICKES. I am not sure that I do. I have under consideration the idea that perhaps Under Secretary West should have, under the Secretary himself, more or less general supervision.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No specific duties have been assigned to that officer?

Secretary ICKES. Special assignments go to him from time to time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is that proving to be a full-time position?

Secretary ICKES. Oh, yes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Those duties, I assume, will not include, in the future, any large amount of time spent in connection with legislative matters on the floor of the House and Senate?

Secretary ICKES. Well, of course, we have had legislative matters in which the Department itself has been interested. If the question implies whether the Under Secretary might not be interested in those, I do not know.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Of course the question was directed at ascertaining whether his new duties in the Interior Department would curtail, perhaps, some of those duties in connection with general legislative matters, which were pursued in the past.

Secretary ICKES. The appointment was made toward the close of the last session. Naturally, of course, Under Secretary West completed the assignments that he had in connection with his old duties. Since then he has come over to the Interior Department, and we expect he will find he has a full-time job there. If he has any extra work, it will be extra.

That is over in the Interior Department, and no duties have been assigned to this Under Secretary. Why should we go on and appropriate money for someone in the Department who is performing no duties?

I hope the Congress will strike this from the appropriation and strike out the position. It is absolutely ridiculous for us to go on in this way with the appropriation.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New York says, when the bill came up a year ago there was a strong showing, I thought, that the Secretary of the Interior needed an Under Secretary. As a matter of fact that Department is as much, if not more, overworked than any department of the Government. The appointment to this position was not made until long near the close of the last session of Congress on August 26. For that reason they have not fully coordinated or reallocated the work. However, the Department of Agriculture has an Under Secretary, the Department of the Treasury has an Under Secretary, the Department of State has an Under Secretary, and the Department of War has an Assistant Secre-



tary at \$10,000 a year. There is no question but that there is very great need for this office. The gentleman from New York while reading should have gone on a little further and completed the sentence, or at least completed what the Secretary of the Interior said. The Secretary of the Interior said:

The appointment was made during the close of the last session. Naturally, of course, Undersecretary West completed the assignments that he had in connection with the old duties. Since then he has come over to the Interior Department, and we expect he will find that he has a full-time job there.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, he had to complete assignments he had in his hands at the time he was appointed before he could take up the activities of the Interior Department, and the Secretary of the Interior expressly says, as I have just read, that since then he has come over to the Interior Department and that they expect he will find that he has a full-time job. There is no question about that. I trust the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 13, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I call attention to the language on page 2, line 5, of the bill which states:

And other personal services in the District of Columbia.

You will find that that language "other personal services in the District of Columbia" recurs in almost every paragraph of the present bill and for every agency which exists or which has been newly set up. Personal services conveys the idea of employing people, and that in turn draws attention to the number of people who are already on the Federal pay roll in the National Capital. My only purpose in contributing to the discussion today is to say a word with reference to this as it bears on the thousands who are on the pay roll and resident in Washington, and the rental situation in Washington, D. C. When I came here in 1933 and found myself suddenly a member of the board of aldermen of the District of Columbia, namely, as a member of the House District Committee, I found considerable complaint about high rentals, not only from Members but from secretarial and stenographic help. People who came from the various States and who were working in the different bureaus and departments were making complaint. Incidentally, the townspeople, workers in the navy yard and elsewhere were complaining.

At that time I carried on a sort of independent investigation and came to the conclusion that perhaps a rental commission might be a splendid means to effectuate reasonable rentals for the city of Washington. After examining the work of the Rent Commission during the war, and the statute and conditions under which it was created, I felt that a rental commission was unconstitutional. It appeared that there was no military emergency or any other emergency under which the due-process clause of the Constitution could be stretched or distorted. Then I discussed the matter with the District officials and particularly the assessor, and he thought perhaps some legislation could be devised to freeze rents as of some day on which rental levels in Washington were reasonable. That, too, is open to objection for the simple reason that any flat measure of that kind might retard a housing recovery which has been under way in Washington, and certainly the most important thing before the country today is the need for an acceleration of home building and other construction in order to diminish the vast number of unemployed. Restrictive measures which might make investment capital timid and afraid to invest would doubtless impair such activities. However, I have continued to give attention to this problem of congestion in the Capital and to the corollary problem of excessive rentals and traffic dangers for a long time in the hope of finding some way of effectuating relief for the thousands of people that are here.

As an evidence of what the situation is, there is eloquent testimony in the report which accompanies this bill in the statement that there are approximately 42,000 people on the pay roll of the Department of the Interior, and that approximately 12,000 or 13,000 of those have been added since 1933. Consider all the bureaus, commissions, and departments in Washington with more than 100,000 workers on the Federal pay roll and you have the crux of the rental situation. You have so many thousands of people here that landlords obviously are going to take the opportunity to increase rentals on existing housing and get what they can in the belief that at some time this overcrowded condition will be dissipated and the net income from their properties diminished accordingly. In seeking to find a way to establish a reasonable rental for thousands of people here it seems to me only one thing can be done, and that is to decentralize some of the bureaus. The more bureaus, the more employees; the more employees the heavier the traffic, and the worse the congestion. Heavier traffic means more accidents; more employees mean a larger rental market and higher rents. A new bureau is set up in this bill. How we are going to do anything for the people who pay exorbitant rentals and solve the traffic problems in the Capital City unless we decentralize these bureaus and diffuse a lot of that personnel help in all sections of the country, I am sure I do not know. Right now Uncle Sam occupies 103 of his own buildings in the city of Washington and rents 101 others. He has 12,000,000 square feet of floor space of his own and rents two and a half millions additional. As yet we have made no provision for the Social Security Board and I suppose they will have 10,000 or 12,000 people. There has been some suggestion that they will send them to Baltimore. That will help matters very little. It will mean that the highway between Baltimore and Washington will become a ghastly speedway and avenue of death. Diffusion must be greater than that. I have a better suggestion. If we are going to continue to set up new bureaus, or if it is contemplated that only those which now exist be kept in operation, let us find out what particular section of the country their interest more nearly affects and then set up offices there and diffuse this help and get rid of the rent and traffic problems here. A portion of the Security Board could very well be set up in Chicago for the western division. The inland waterways work to some extent could be transferred to St. Louis and some of the Agricultural Department work could be transferred to Des Moines and Peoria; other agencies could be sent to San Francisco and Spokane and elsewhere, and so we could reduce all these appropriations for personal services in the District of Columbia very substantially.

Just why every agency must be dragged to the National Capital is difficult to understand. If the work of this agency affects the West, or the central West, the Mississippi Valley or New England, the Northwest or the South, why not set them up in those areas where the work is located and skeletonize the central offices here. The benefits will be twofold. First, it will aid other communities in rehabilitating purchasing power. It will diffuse employment in other sections of the Nation, and secondly, it will relieve the immense burdens here.

When we do, we will solve this problem of congestion that has cost almost one life every 2 days since the 1st of January 1936. Then we will also solve the housing problem in Washington and the problem of excessive rentals without trying to get through Congress some sumptuary legislation with which to beat the landlords over the head.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Might we not encounter more grave danger than the question of rentals in Washington if we establish a Government operating agency in the different cities over the country and invite the people of those cities and communities to sponsor those bureaus and undertake to enlarge them from time to time, and hammer Congress to vote for appropriations?



Now comes the additions to the forces of the Veterans' Administration to handle the bonus. I have heard it said that 2,500 or 3,000 extra people will be required. Where will they be housed? How will augmented traffic be handled without further fatalities? Obviously the increase in employees will present an excellent chance for landlords to boost rents, and the only escape from this condition is decentralization.

There is still another aspect to this matter. The Select Committee of the House to Investigate Real Estate Reorganizations, on which I served, learned in the course of their investigations in Chicago, Detroit, St. Louis, and elsewhere that millions of square feet of commercial floor space is still vacant in large buildings. Vacant space in buildings on which bonds were sold to the public means diminished earnings and diminished dividends or no dividends at all to the holders of these securities. If the Federal Government, instead of filling Washington to overflowing with bureaus and commissions, would establish some of them in other cities, some of this available space could be used. Its use would mean income for many real-estate bondholders and funds with which to pay taxes and maintenance costs of these buildings.

Therefore I most respectfully suggest that some of these Government functions be transferred to Chicago, Peoria, Detroit, Cleveland, Boston, Dallas, and elsewhere as the solution of many problems. It would be a bit of a "break" for the taxpayers in such communities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 11, strike out the last word.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, all the committee wanted was the exact language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. If it was germane, we agree to the amendment. We would all like to have rents lowered in Washington, D. C., and we would like to have it put into this bill, if possible; but striking out the last word will not do it. So therefore that is the end of the argument.

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Only one pro-forma amendment to each paragraph is permissible.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to vote for this appropriation. I am one who would like to see all appropriations cut 25 percent or more. We must do something more than appropriate money in this Congress. That is about all we seem to be doing, appropriating and borrowing money to make good the appropriations.

On top of our heavy appropriations, ordinary and extraordinary, we shall have to appropriate a high sum in accordance with the communication just sent by the President to our Speaker. I believe the communication is now on the way to the Committee on Appropriations to remain there. A large appropriation is going to be made for over \$2,000,000 to raise money to pay the bonus, which we have rightly authorized to be paid by recent legislation. For the life of me, I cannot understand why a copy of that communication was not sent over to the Committee on Ways and Means for action on the part of that committee to raise the income account to offset the other and overburdened outgo side of the ledger.

We must be concerned with more than one side of the ledger. We cannot go on appropriating money indefinitely without providing the means for raising the money to pay

the bill. The Ways and Means Committee has made it plain that it does not plan any new taxes this year. It does not have the heart to go to the country with another tax bill, and this Congress does not have the heart to exact more taxes from the taxpayers. But there is one thing the Ways and Means Committee can do. It has before it now a bill that will raise, without hardship on anyone, a huge sum of money which may be used to defray the expenses of government.

What we need today is a Robert Morris to come to the aid of our Government. There is none such in the country. The only alternative is that our people must club together and contribute to a fund to be collected so that we may offset the large appropriations and the ever-mounting national debt.

The best way and the only way we can do it without taxation, and I have not heard anybody on this floor or in this Congress suggest a better plan, is to get the Ways and Means Committee to report to the House for a vote or my bill for raising the needed money by the conduct of a national lottery. [Applause.] So, Mr. Chairman, tomorrow morning, in order to spur the committee, there will be placed on the Speaker's desk a petition to discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill. Two hundred and eighteen Members by signing the petition can bring the bill to the floor of this House for vote. Members of Congress can make this petition a new declaration of economic independence. Our patriots of old resorted to the lottery in times of stress and emergency. We do not want to neglect our piling debt nor are we willing to break further the already broken backs of the taxpayers. We shall do neither of these things, but, on the contrary, shall fulfill a duty we owe to the taxpayers, the Government, and the Nation if we resort to the lottery—the old aristocrat of all emergency measures.

Down in the Isthmus of Panama, where there is a population of something like 472,468, exclusive of the occupants of the Canal Zone, the lottery provides each week for charitable purposes a sum ranging between twenty-five and thirty thousand dollars. The yearly lottery revenue exceeds more than a million and a half dollars. That averages in income amounts to more than \$3 per capita per person. In this country with our resources we could do better than twice as well. We have a population of 120,000,000 people, and if we could do twice as well as Panama, and we can, we could, without bearing down on the taxpayers, raise an amount equal to \$6 per capita. On that basis the revenue to be gained from this source would amount to \$720,000,000 a year. By doing a little better than twice as well the yearly lottery revenue would grow to a billion.

The passage of my lottery bill would not only retain firmly the confidence which we have restored, but the funds from the lottery would be enough to retire the whole national debt within a reasonable period of time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KENNEY] has expired.

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### DIVISION OF GRAZING CONTROL

For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), including traveling and other necessary expenses, not to exceed \$55,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, not to exceed \$20,000 for the purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed \$150,000 for examination and classification of lands with respect to agriculture and agricultural utility as required by the public-land laws and for related administrative operations and for the preparation and publication of land classification maps and reports, \$300,000; for payment of \$5 per diem while actually employed in lieu of subsistence and for payment of 5 cents per mile for actual necessary travel expenses of members of advisory committees of local stockmen, \$100,000; in all, \$400,000.

For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements within grazing districts, pursuant to the provisions of sections 10 and 11 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat., p. 1269), and not including contributions under section 9 of said act, \$250,000:



*Provided*, That expenditures hereunder in any grazing district shall not exceed 25 percent of all moneys received under the provisions of said act from such district during the fiscal years 1936 and 1937.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOTT: On page 5, line 9, after the word "all", strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$250,000."

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, reference to page 18 of the committee's report will show that for grazing control, in the matter of salaries and expenses, while the 1936 appropriation amounted to only \$250,000, this year the Secretary of the Interior is asking for \$400,000.

If you look at the hearings before the Public Lands Committee for last session and the session before, you will find it was contended there by those opposed to this bill that if the Congress ever passed an act of this kind, turning the entire public domain of the United States over to the arbitrary, discretionary jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, an autocratic bureau would be set up which would become larger and larger every year, and that each year the Secretary of the Interior would be asking the taxpayers for a huge additional amount of money. That contention has been borne out by experience. In my opinion, the act under which this appropriation is asked is one of the most useless and one of the most damaging pieces of legislation that the Congress has passed. This year the Secretary of the Interior, to operate that Bureau set up under the Taylor Grazing Act, is asking for almost twice as much money as he asked for last year. Next year the activities of this Bureau will be still further increased, and the Secretary of the Interior will ask for a still larger amount of money. He will keep going on and on and on until this alleged grazing-control proposition will be one of the largest and one of the most irresponsible bureaus in the executive department of our Government. I think it is time to call a halt on the kind of discretionary authority and dictatorial power given by the Congress to the Secretary of the Interior under this act, and we ought to begin now by confining this appropriation, if we appropriate anything, to the amount given the Secretary at the time the bill was originally passed.

As I say, he is asking nearly twice as much now and next year will probably ask twice as much as he is given this year. I think my amendment, which cuts down the amount for salaries and other expenditures to the amount the Secretary had under the original bill, should be adopted.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I well remember that the gentleman from Oregon bitterly fought this law all the way through the Public Lands Committee and the House, and tried his utmost to prevent its passage. It was enacted, however, and heartily approved by the President on June 28, 1934, and has proven one of the most popular and beneficent laws ever enacted in this country. It has for its purpose the conservation and orderly use of the remaining 143,000,000 acres of public domain, and the stabilization of the livestock industry throughout the Western States. Instead of having a large bureau here in Washington, it is the only very important activity we have set up for years which is practically controlled and administered out in the field among and by the people directly affected by it. Every district has its managing committee composed of an equal number of cattlemen and sheepmen who apportion the range among those most entitled to use it, and in numbers and amounts, and times and places, and thereby conserving the range, and they are doing splendid work. This law is becoming more and more popular every day.

In my general remarks I explained how this apparent large increase came about. As a matter of fact, it is not in reality any increase whatever. The Secretary has been keeping absolutely within the amount of money we appropriated for the purposes intended. In this amount of \$68,000 transferred from the Geological Survey for land classification is because this land has got to be classified in order to intelligently use it, and for the purposes of its use this Grazing

Division can more suitably do it than the Geological Survey can.

This amendment, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, is simply a continuation of the persistent attack that has been kept up for 2 years on this measure. If the House will permit a personal reference, I confess to being more proud of being the author of this so-called Taylor Grazing Act than of any of the about a hundred laws I have piloted through Congress during the past 27 years. Thousands of people have praised it as one of the most far-reaching and constructive measures looking to the preservation and improvement of the remaining public lands of our country and for the stabilization of the livestock industry and of the Nation-wide benefit that has ever been enacted by Congress. There is no way of estimating the value of this law to the West throughout the years to come. I have always lived among the stockmen, and my home has been on the range all my life, so I know those people.

This amendment is simply an effort to hamstring the administration of this law.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. Is it not a fact that since the original appropriation was made under this bill the Secretary of the Interior has spent very little of that appropriation, because there was not anything to do?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. He has not until recently had time to consult the wishes of all the local stockmen throughout all those States and get the grazing districts organized. That has required an immense amount of time and consideration.

Mr. MOTT. No. He has not done anything in the past, and there is no very good reason to believe he is going to do much more in the future.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman is entirely misinformed. If he will read the hearings he will find that some 30 or more districts have already been organized, and they are now in active operation all over the Western States even in the gentleman's own State, and many more would be organized if the acreage had not been limited to 80,000,000 acres instead of all of the public domain as it was in the bill as it originally passed the House.

Mr. MOTT. He has practically all of the \$225,000 we gave him last year, has he not?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No, he does not. It has been and is a slow process to entirely change the customs of many thousands of stockmen and ranchmen. This law had to be fully and repeatedly explained to large numbers of those people. There has been no disposition to force it on them. All districts have been organized by the wishes of the people affected by them. There is no activity in the Government that is run so economically as this. The Secretary needs every dollar we are giving him in this bill.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the point I am making is that, as I understand it, he has practically all that money left.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; he does not.

Mr. MOTT. He is asking now, if the gentleman please, \$55,000 for personal service; \$28,000 for the purchase and maintenance of automobiles; \$150,000 for administrative expenses; and \$300,000 for making reports and maps. This is what he wants under this bill. He wants this in addition to the \$225,000 we gave him but which he has not expended.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The \$300,000 figure the gentleman mentioned is the total of the other items he mentioned.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague the gentleman from Oregon has presented an amendment. The gentleman certainly does not know very much about the public domain in the United States. The public domain of Oregon lies in my district and not in his district. I happen to know much about the activities of the group of men that has been classifying these



grazing lands. I know they have been very active and very capable. I know further that no act passed by this Congress is so popular with the majority of the stockmen as this act. It is going to be fully self-sustaining when it is in operation. The men who use the public domain for sheep and cattle will pay fees to the Government that will more than take up the expenses of enforcement. This appropriation is simply for organization. My colleague's fears are groundless, and his amendment will hamstring those who operate under one of the most beneficial acts this Congress has passed. I hope the amendment is defeated.

By unanimous consent, the pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 13, noes 41.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer to a paragraph which I did not hear the Clerk read.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against going back to a previous paragraph after the Clerk starts reading a subsequent paragraph.

Mr. TABER. The paragraph could not have been read, because I was watching for it.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. To which paragraph does the gentleman refer?

Mr. TABER. Page 5, lines 10 to 18.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The paragraph was read.

Mr. TABER. I was watching every word, and I did not hear it read. I heard the part down below, but I did not hear this one.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that the paragraph was read before the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] offered his amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] was on his feet offering an amendment and asking for recognition immediately at the conclusion of the reading of line 9, page 5. He offered his amendment at the proper place. If the next paragraph was read before that, it was improperly read. It certainly was not read after the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] was acted upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment is offered to a previous paragraph.

Mr. TABER. An amendment was offered to the paragraph on page 5, beginning at line 9, reducing the figure from \$400,000 to \$250,000. It is true that the Clerk did read some of the following paragraph after the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] rose and demanded recognition, but it is not true that the subsequent paragraph was properly read.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I feel that my point of order is good, but I am going to withdraw it, because the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is not going to be adopted anyway. I withdraw my point of order if the gentleman will not talk over 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 5, lines 10 to 18, strike out all of lines 10 to 18, inclusive.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have been over the hearings very carefully and I have been unable to find anything except a general statement as to how it is proposed to use this \$250,000 for construction purposes, nor anything in reference to what the construction shall be, the character of it, or whether or not it would amount to anything. There is nothing in the hearings to disclose any information. Frankly I do not believe in increasing these appropriation bills, even if there is a limitation on the source of the money, for any

purpose which is not fairly and openly disclosed to the Members of Congress. I have offered this amendment to strike out those lines. I do not believe we can get anywhere by continually increasing the sums of money we appropriate for these things. I am, therefore, giving the Members of Congress another chance to vote down proposed increases in expenditures.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] evidently does not understand this law or its provisions. The \$250,000 is to be collected from these people themselves, the stockmen who use the range. If the money is not collected from these men who range their cattle and sheep on the public domain this appropriation will not be made. If the gentleman from New York will read page 20 of the hearings he will find a full explanation and description of this item.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word merely to explain to the gentleman from New York what this appropriation means.

Mr. Chairman, on these big ranges hundreds of miles across buildings are erected where men may stay overnight, feed themselves, and care for their horses. Sheep and cattle have to be counted; corrals must be provided for counting. They have to provide water in these camps or headquarters. These facilities must be provided in different parts of the range, sometimes miles apart. This appropriation my colleague seeks to reduce is to provide facilities much the same as the patrols or guards use in the forest reserve. This money will all be repaid by fees collected for use of the public domain from the sheepmen and cattlemen themselves.

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### PERRY'S VICTORY MEMORIAL COMMISSION

For administration, protection, maintenance, and preservation of the Perry's Victory Memorial at Put in Bay, Ohio, including traveling and other expenses of members of the Commission in connection with official matters pertaining to the memorial, printing and binding, personal services, and the purchase of souvenirs for resale, \$4,000: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall not exceed the aggregate receipts covered into the Treasury in accordance with section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this pro-forma amendment for the purpose of stating to the House in connection with this Perry's Victory Memorial Commission that there is a bill pending on the Union Calendar, H. R. 8474, for the erection of Perry's Victory Memorial and International Peace Memorial at Put in Bay, at precisely the same place where the monument covered by this paragraph is located.

I am not insensible to the fact that the present memorial is more or less self-maintained; but, I believe, in line with the admonition of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, that something ought to be said about these bills which appropriate small amounts for little things and are subsequently followed with requests for appropriations in larger amounts. Very briefly, let me tell you some of the things that are covered by bills now on the Union Calendar. There is, for instance, a bill to establish a park at Saratoga, N. Y.; one to enlarge Baker Park out in Washington. There is a bill to build a monument at San Juan, in Puerto Rico.

Also a bill to enlarge or to build a colonial national monument in Virginia; another one to make a park out of the Daniel Freeman Homestead, in Nebraska; another one to commemorate the Battle of Blackstock; another one to commemorate the Battle of Musgrove's Mill; still another to commemorate the Battle of Big Dry Wash, in Arizona—and, may I say parenthetically, I have been a rather assiduous student of history, but I never realized that a knowledge of all these battles and their commemoration made any difference in the ordinary processes of government so far as I



could determine, or that they were of sufficient concern to the public to warrant the expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

Then our good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK], the other day, had a bill on the calendar to create a commission to study the feasibility of establishing national monuments in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. If enacted, such a commission would doubtless recommend monuments by the dozen instead of singly.

Then there is another bill for a monument on St. Simon Island, down in Georgia, and also a monument to Lafayette, and also a national monument at Camp Merritt, N. J., and a bill for the enlargement of the Everglades National Park in Florida, a Mark Twain anniversary commission, and here is a prize winner, a monument to commemorate the entry of the first steam railroad into Washington, D. C. Now, that is something to write home about. Then a monument to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of Prattville, Ala.

Maybe this has some bearing upon national history, but here you have a list of some of the things that call for appropriations. If we stick a monument down on St. Simon Island in Georgia, you know what the next stanza will be in that story. They will buy some area around that monument to create a little park, and then there will be a bill introduced in the Congress to create a St. Simon Park or some other kind of park, followed by demands for annual appropriations to dust off the monument and keep the grass green.

Gradually, these inroads are being made on the Federal Treasury for things that have no particular national import, and I think the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] is exactly right when he says that we ought to be cautious about this sort of thing. These bills, for the most part, ought to be firmly objected to and never allowed to pass the House.

Michael Angelo once said that trifles make perfection, and we may achieve perfection in Government economy if we start with some of these little things and then work up to the top, and I suggest we start right now and wipe the slate clean of these little things which are gentle, little creatures that are almost as prolific as a certain noted family way up in Callander, Ontario. [Laughter and applause.]

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### NATIONAL BITUMINOUS COAL COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenditures of the National Bituminous Coal Commission, in performing the duties imposed upon said Commission by the Bituminous Coal Conservation Act of 1935, approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat., p. 991), including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, contract stenographic reporting services, stationery and office supplies and equipment, printing and binding, and not to exceed \$2,500 for newspapers, reference books, and periodicals, \$900,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Page 11, line 6, after the figures "\$300,000", strike out the section down to and including line 3, on page 12.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, is there not a mistake in the amendment as read? Is it not the gentleman's intention to strike out the paragraph about the National Bituminous Coal Commission?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Then the amendment should strike out all of line 6 and through line 16, including the period following the amount \$900,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Page 11, line 6, after the figures "\$300,000", strike out the section down to and including line 16, on page 11.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this item for the National Bituminous Coal Commission appears, of course,

for the first time in this bill this year. It appears as a result of the enactment of legislation during the last session of Congress—legislation enacted after the receipt of a letter from the President of the United States, in which, as I have already stated this morning, he expressed the hope that the committee would not permit any "doubts as to constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation."

The item calls for the expenditure of almost \$1,000,000. The hearing indicates a further increase in the appropriation should this activity be declared constitutional by the Court.

The item includes about \$200,000 for a legal force of 80 persons and about \$83,000 for a statistical force of 34 persons, although it was suggested this work might be done more cheaply by the Bureau of Mines. It includes also about \$18,500 for an information and editing service of nine persons.

The amount involved is substantial. Many of us have felt from the outset that this legislation was clearly unconstitutional. The recent findings by the Supreme Court, insofar as my judgment is concerned, have tended to confirm my original conclusions and have made almost certain to my mind a finding by the Supreme Court that this particular bill is unconstitutional.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. The gentleman understands that an entirely different constitutional power is relied upon for the support of the validity of the Guffey coal bill than in the support of the Triple A.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand, of course, that the two questions are not on all fours.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I want to call attention to the fact that the clause in the Constitution relied upon for the support of the Guffey coal bill is not the same clause that was relied upon for the support of the Triple A.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am not going to argue the constitutional question with the able gentleman from Kentucky. I say that in my judgment the recent action of the Supreme Court tends to confirm my original opinion that the act was unconstitutional. I might refer the gentleman from Kentucky to the very able argument made by his distinguished colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] at the time the legislation was considered.

I want to say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that I offer this amendment without reference to the merits of the broad objectives of the bill, in respect to which there may be little difference of opinion. The House having taken the exceptional action which it did recently in respect to the potato-control bill, it seems to me that the same action should be taken in respect to this legislation, withholding for the time being the appropriation of nearly a million dollars pending action of the Supreme Court, which no doubt will be taken in the near future.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This same matter was fought out last week on the deficiency bill. It seems to me that the opponents of the Guffey coal bill, in the consideration of this appropriation bill, should not try to by indirection that which they were unable to do directly, when the original bill was under consideration.

Now, I cannot say—and no Member of this House can say—what the Supreme Court will do when the matter of the constitutionality of the coal act is presented to them on its merits.

It is easy for a person to say that a bill is unconstitutional. But I want to call the attention of the House again to the fact that the constitutional power relied upon in the Guffey coal bill is not the same power relied upon for the support of the A. A. A.

Mr. TABER. Will he gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the Supreme Court has already held that the commerce clause does not cover the mining of coal?



Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, my friend from New York, Mr. TABER, who is one of the hardest-working Members of this body, certainly was absent when I endeavored to treat this subject when debating the original bill. I then called attention to the *Coronado* case, written by Chief Justice Taft, to which the gentleman referred. That is the case which says that mining of coal is an intrastate transaction; but immediately after Chief Justice Taft, a distinguished leader of the gentleman's party and a distinguished President of the United States and a distinguished Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, said that mining of coal was an intrastate transaction, he said with the same voice and with the same pen that Congress had the power of control and supervision of those acts if Congress saw fit to use it.

It was in this first *Coronado* case (259 U. S. 354) that Chief Justice Taft, on June 5, 1922, held that coal mining is not interstate commerce and that the power of Congress does not extend to its regulation as such. Following are direct quotations from this case:

Coal mining is not interstate commerce, and the power of Congress does not extend to its regulation as such.

The making of goods and the mining of coal are not commerce, nor does the fact that these things are to be afterward shipped or used in interstate commerce make their production a part thereof.

Obstruction to coal mining is not a direct obstruction to interstate commerce in coal, although it, of course, may affect it by reducing the amount of coal to be carried in that commerce. We have had occasion to consider the principles governing the validity of congressional restraint of such indirect obstructions to interstate commerce in *Swift v. United States* (cases cited).

Now, one of the cases cited in the last quotation next above is the packers and stockyards' case decided May 1, 1922 (*Stafford v. Wallace*, 258 U. S. 495). This case was the one in which Chief Justice Taft made the following statement:

The reasonable fear by Congress that such acts, usually lawful and affecting only intrastate commerce when considered alone, will probably and more or less constantly be used in conspiracies against interstate commerce or constitute a direct and undue burden on it, expressed in this remedial legislation, serves the same purpose as the intent charged in the *Swift* indictment to bring acts of a similar character into the current of interstate commerce for Federal restraint.

Further quoting from the *Stafford v. Wallace* (258 U. S. 495):

"Whatever amounts to more or less constant practice and threatens to obstruct or unduly to burden the freedom of interstate commerce is within the regulatory power of Congress under the commerce clause, and it is primarily for Congress to consider and decide the fact of the danger and meet it.

"This Court will certainly not substitute its judgment for that of Congress in such a matter unless the relation of the subject to interstate commerce and its effect upon it are clearly nonexistent."

Immediately after this *Stafford* citation, Chief Justice Taft said:

It is clear from these cases that if Congress deems recurring practices, though not really part of interstate commerce, likely to obstruct, restrain, or burden it, it has the power to subject them to national supervision and restraint.

We submit that Chief Justice Taft laid down the rule that findings of fact by the Congress of the United States precludes even the Supreme Court from substituting its judgment for that of Congress in such a matter unless the relation of the subject to interstate commerce and its effect upon it are clearly nonexistent. He said that in the case of *Stafford v. Wallace* (258 U. S. 495). He upheld the finding of facts by Congress that certain recurring practices, intrastate in nature, was a burden and interference upon interstate commerce in the case of *Board of Trade v. Olson* (262 U. S. 1).

It was in the case of *Hill v. Wallace* (259 U. S. 44) that a decision very similar to the A. A. A. decision appeared. The taxing power was relied upon to regulate and control the grain marts of the country. That act was held unconstitutional by Chief Justice Taft.

In the opinion he said that the taxing power alone was the source of power relied upon; that mention of the commerce clause could not be found in the statute from the beginning to the end. It was held in that case that tax was invalidated, as it sought to regulate intrastate transactions which were beyond constitutional power. That is exactly the situation in the Hoosac case; the levy is stricken down there because, as

Mr. Justice Roberts said, the thing sought to be regulated was not within constitutional power because it was intrastate transactions. After the case of *Hill* against *Wallace*, Congress passed a second act endeavoring to regulate the grain marts of the country, but in this act the commerce power in the Constitution was relied upon. There were findings of facts by the Congress that there were constant and recurring practices—intrastate transactions—that burdened and hindered the flow of interstate commerce. Chief Justice Taft upheld the validity of the act in a very illuminating opinion. This law is on the books today; it is in full force and effect today. We respectfully submit that the Taft philosophy with respect to the commerce clause is the groundwork and the foundation rock of the power that creates the Bituminous Coal Commission.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. CROWTHER. What has the gentleman got to offer with regard to A. A. A. decision in the matter of taxes, in relation to the decision of Chief Justice Taft in the second child-labor decision?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. There is a marked distinction in the A. A. A. case. The tax is held invalid, as I read the decision, because it was to be used for the regulation of that which was beyond constitutional power. In the Guffey Coal Act we maintain that the acts sought to be regulated by this tax is within the constitutional power and therefore valid.

My good friend from New York, Mr. CROWTHER, will distinctly recall that in the hearings on the Guffey coal bill we agreed that if our case is not brought under the commerce clause of the Constitution, that it cannot be supported under the taxing power. This is not a new position. This position was taken while the committee was considering the bill, during the hearings on the bill, and this has been our position from that day to this present day. If we do not bring our case within the commerce clause, I can say to my good friend from New York that we would fall under the adverse rulings of the Supreme Court, namely, the Child Labor case, where the taxing power alone was involved; and *Hill* against *Wallace*, where the taxing power alone was involved; and the Hoosac case—the A. A. A.—where the taxing power alone was involved. The opinion of the Supreme Court in the Hoosac case, as I read it, very clearly states that the invalidity of the tax is due to its being used to regulate that which is beyond constitutional power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. The hearings on the Guffey coal bill are given in some detail on pages 104 to 109 of the hearings. The point to which I wish to call special attention is that the Guffey-Snyder Act will contribute a very considerable revenue to the Treasury of the United States, subject to the disposition of Congress. The production of bituminous coal in 1934 was approximately 360,000,000 tons and the average value of this coal at the mine was something like \$2 per ton. The tax provided in the bill is 1½ percent, or something like 3 cents per ton. Based on the production of 1934 the yield from this tax would be over \$10,000,000, and with the undoubted increase in the production of the coming year to approximately 400,000,000 tons the tax would amount to something like \$12,000,000. The cost of the maintenance and operation of the Guffey Bituminous Coal Commission, including the consumers' counsel, would be approximately \$990,000, as provided for in the Budget. Therefore, there is no net charge on the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I want to say at this point that the Guffey Coal Act and the creation of the National Bituminous Coal Commission have operated in my State and in other mining States to put an industry that was crippled and down for the count of nine on its feet and show the



first ray of hope not only to the miner but to the mine operator as well. Congress, after passing this much-needed legislation, cannot fail to provide proper funds to provide for the maintenance and operation of the offices that are necessary to the functioning of the same. This is a responsibility that I am certain we will not shirk.

Mr. HOLLISTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON] has contended with his usual force and skill that the Guffey coal bill is based on a proper exercise of congressional power under the commerce clause. The gentleman, however, refers continually to that line of cases where the regulation by Congress of an act which might appear at first to be purely intrastate has been held by the Supreme Court to be such an integral part of a movement of goods from their source to their final point of distribution that it constitutes a part of the stream of interstate commerce. That line of cases is, of course, familiar to every lawyer, and if the Guffey coal bill were properly based on that line of cases or could be placed under it, there would be ground for contending that it is within the constitutional power of Congress. However, the Guffey coal bill places a tax on the sale of coal—not somewhere in the stream of commerce but when the coal first begins its trip from the mine. The Supreme Court has held on any number of occasions—I am sorry that, not realizing this was to come up today, I am not prepared to cite them all, although I could give them to the gentleman—that manufacturing, mining, and agriculture are not within the control of the Congress under the commerce clause.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLLISTER. If the gentleman will permit me first to finish my statement, then I shall be glad to yield. I can refer the gentleman from Kentucky at the present time, with reference to the question of whether or not mining is within the control of Congress under the commerce clause, to the case of *Heisler v. Thomas Colliery Co.* (260 U. S. 245) and the case of *Oliver Iron Co. v. Lord* (262 U. S. 172).

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. It is in connection with the Coronado case I wanted to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HOLLISTER. The Coronado case is a conspiracy case.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. There are two Coronado cases. Justice Taft wrote both opinions, but in the case where Justice Taft said that the mining of coal was an intrastate transaction, the gentleman will agree, in the next paragraph he said that Congress had the power the control the facts.

Mr. HOLLISTER. The gentleman is asking me a question which I am not able, without the report before me, to answer by stating just exactly what a particular justice did or did not say.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. It was an express invitation.

Mr. HOLLISTER. The gentleman will please wait until I finish because I have a limited amount of time. The gentleman will also realize that obiter dicta, in cases where the court sometimes goes beyond the particular question under consideration, cannot be cited as authority in other cases. The Supreme Court has held over and over again that mining, manufacturing, and agriculture themselves are not in interstate commerce and may not be regulated by Congress. Here is an attempt under the Guffey coal bill to bring about the regulation of actions not in the stream of interstate commerce. Here is an enactment which almost any lawyer would stake his reputation will be held unconstitutional, and it does not seem fit that we should go ahead and appropriate millions of dollars to enforce statutes of this kind and delude poor, innocent individuals who are trying to comply, only to find, as they did under the A. A. A., that they were deluded, and that the whole taxation situation and the whole legal situation is in a worse mess than it was before.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLLISTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I voted for the Guffey coal bill, and I am very much interested in it being upheld by the Court, but I am

fearful of one feature of it, which the gentleman has not discussed, and that is the taxing provision, which provides that a tax shall be levied upon the market sales price of coal at the tipple, and that that shall be used or rebated to the operator who accepts the provisions of it and withheld from one who does not. Whether it is a revenue measure or a punitive tax is the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLLISTER] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I voted against the Guffey coal bill, but I am opposed to the motion made by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

I have enjoyed very much listening to the constitutional argument. I have found it very, very interesting, but it seems to me it is entirely irrelevant, or only remotely connected, with the issue which is presented by the pending motion.

The Guffey coal bill was passed last year. This is an authorization in order to put it into operation. The legal steps taken by those who are raising the question of the constitutionality of the Guffey coal bill, have been instituted and are now pending in the courts. It seems to me that the basic question of constitutionality was properly discussed last year. It interested me with respect to the tax. I have my views as to whether or not it is constitutional in that respect. I believe that the objective sought, in a constitutional way, is something that most of us would admit is a worthy and deserving objective, namely, the ability of business to control itself against unscrupulous competitors, or to regulate those disintegrating influences which have a harmful effect upon both the employer and the employee, and upon society in general. We have to go along. Congress must pass legislation and it must be submitted to the courts for judicial determination. That is the pathway of legislation under our scheme of Government, the written Constitution—Congress passing legislation and the courts interpreting it, so that the legislative activities of this country are twofold. First, the legislative act, either being approved or disapproved by the Chief Executive, and then in the final analysis, interpretation by the Supreme Court as to whether or not the Congress acted within the powers granted by the Constitution.

The interesting question of the constitutionality was well discussed last year. As one who was impressed by it, and for other reasons, I voted against the bill, although I am in favor of the objective sought. I feel that the constitutional question on this occasion is not properly before the committee. It is an argument interesting to listen to, but should not be a reason for any Member, no matter how he voted last year, for voting against the appropriation this year. For these reasons, while I voted against the bill last year, I am equally opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLLISTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOLLISTER. I have listened with much interest to what the gentleman has said, and as an ordinary matter the gentleman is absolutely right. I believe that ordinarily these things should be left for settlement as the gentleman suggests, but when we have a situation, as we have today, of act after act being passed with the practical knowledge of a great many, at least, who are voting for them that these acts will be held unconstitutional, it does seem wrong and unfair to allow people to be deluded into thinking they can get the protection which the gentleman and I would equally like to give them by legislation of this kind. It does not seem right that they should be sold a gold brick.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. It seems to me the gentleman from Ohio should not use that expression, "deluding the people", when two Federal district courts, one in the District of Columbia, Justice Adkins, upheld the stabilizing feature of the bill, and another district judge, Judge Hamilton, has



also upheld it. If that is true, then why does the distinguished gentleman from Ohio continually say that we are handing somebody a "gold brick" because those courts did not agree with him?

Mr. HOLLISTER. I would ask the gentleman to wait until the decision comes down from the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLLISTER] agrees with the substance of my argument. I feel quite pleased that the thoughts which I entertain are in harmony with the thoughts of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I may say to the gentleman I shall be glad to yield to him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Yes; but first I would like to find out from the gentleman from Ohio just what constitution he is talking about, the Constitution of 1787, or the Constitution of 1936 with the fourteenth amendment and everything else included, amongst which are many bad Supreme Court decisions.

Mr. HOLLISTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Yes; which constitution is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. HOLLISTER. I am talking about the Constitution I understood the gentleman from Washington and I were both operating under, the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I object to so much time being taken up about this particular section. As a member of this subcommittee, I watched the preceding section pass without a minute of debate when \$300,000 was appropriated for oil control for Texas, for Tyler, Tex., because they found a lot of oil in a hurry down there, because a lot of little fellows happened to find it on their ranches; so the Government of the United States is going to spend \$300,000 to help the big fellows freeze the little fellows out, and not one word was said about it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot, of course, comment on the remarks of my friend who just spoke, because they apply in a different way than I have expressed myself. However, I want to refer to the remark of the gentleman from Ohio about "deluding the people."

The Constitution of 1787 is the Constitution of today, and I am perfectly contented and satisfied with it. Thus briefly do I express my views, but the gentleman from Ohio realizes that government itself is a living organism. While the human rights contained in our fundamental law are definite, the structure called government is a living organism, and it must go forward. We have got to look at things differently today than we did 100 years ago or 150 years ago when we were a nation of five or six million souls and 13 States. Economic development has brought changes; the situation that confronts us is entirely different in character. I am not going to go through the whole picture with which you gentlemen are better acquainted than I.

The progress and changes of economic laws bring with it social and political changes; bring abuses which must be controlled; which must be regulated; abuses arising out of private industry, which private industry is unable to control, the continuance of which will be harmful to the general welfare. It is only natural; it is only proper that the people look for a control of these abuses to the Government, whether the Republican Party is in control of the Government or the Democratic Party.

The legislative branch of the Government must experiment, must keep going forward in order to make and keep Government a living organism, meeting and performing its duties. This is all that we are doing, and this is not "deluding the public." I do not think the gentleman, in all sincerity—he is a fair and a distinguished man—means to let that charge remain in his remarks. I hope upon reflection he will express himself differently.

The N. R. A., many of us realize, was more of a temporary expedient in order to meet an emergency situation than it was long-range legislation. We have got to legislate from the angle of emergency when one exists, just the same as we must legislate from the angle of long-range permanency. The N. R. A., as originally passed, was never intended as permanent legislation; but you and I know that something is going to come out of the N. R. A. We know that when a proper public opinion has been formulated that something is going to be done along the line of the N. R. A., and demanded by business itself.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Industry cannot continue subject to the unfair competition of the unscrupulous 10 percent of business, a minority undermining and disintegrating the entire business structure. Ninety percent of business men want to do the right thing; want to pay their employees a living wage; want to give them reasonable working hours; but cannot because of the unscrupulous competition of a small minority. Competition is not a community matter like it used to be; today it is Nation-wide, yes, world-wide.

We did not know that the N. R. A. was unconstitutional at the time we passed it; not until the Court passed upon the law did we learn that. But we are all agreed with its objectives and feel that some of its objectives must be accomplished, whether by this administration or some future administration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman, but I have finished.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I wish to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts tell me whether he believes in competition in the future or not?

Mr. McCORMACK. Why does the gentleman ask that question?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The gentleman said something about competition being ruthless.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said that competition of unscrupulous business men and their relation to the operations of the honorable business men had a disintegrating effect upon business in general.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Which are in the majority, in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. McCORMACK. Why, the number of honorable business men are in the great majority.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Well, I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. We all have a right to our individual opinions.

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 32, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.



The Clerk read as follows:

For the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$493,770.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question. It seems to me this is one of the items in which there is a substantial increase. I have been unable, after examining the hearings, to see any reasonable justification for this increase, which amounts to \$21,860. Does not the chairman of the subcommittee think we could get along if we appropriated the same amount allowed last year?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I may say to the gentleman that we have only provided for three new employees. That is my recollection.

Mr. TABER. The amount of increase is \$21,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. My understanding is, I may say to the gentleman from New York, that there were a good many lapsed salaries and administrative furloughs which will not occur to such a great extent next year. That is one explanation given to us.

Mr. TABER. The Budget figures seem to indicate seven new employees. It does seem as if we might be able to get along without continually increasing the employees of these various departments. I think that we really ought to reduce this item to what it was last year.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. You will find at the top of the tabulation on page 697 there is one clerk provided for at \$2,300 and two file clerks at \$1,440 each. We thought the showing justified this increase. They have an immense amount of work to do, and I thought the hearing justified it. That is the reason our committee granted it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 16, line 21, strike out "\$493,770" and insert in lieu thereof "\$471,910."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment to reduce this appropriation to the exact amount it was last year. I do not see how we can continually increase these appropriations without getting into trouble. Frankly, I think we ought to adopt amendments that will reduce these appropriations and this Committee should as far as it can cut them down. There are no new activities in connection with this operation which would justify, in my opinion, an increase in personnel, and I believe that the amount should therefore be reduced to what it was last year. They will certainly have enough money to get along on if they receive the same amount they have for the current year. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at the bottom of page 698 there is an additional explanation of this particular item. The gentleman from New York will realize that there are reallocations and promotions under the Classification Act, and this increased item is merely to take care of the regular promotions and reallocations under that law. That is all set forth in the last paragraph. It says:

From July 1, 1934, to June 30, 1935, there were 13 employees reallocated in the higher grades. The reallocations involve an increase in pay of \$6,000 annually. A corresponding increase in appropriations has not been made. Since July 1, 1935, 13 other positions have been reallocated involving an additional pay of \$5,180. At the time of our Budget hearings only three of these reallocations had been approved.

They then go ahead and show the salaries paid to these officials during various administrations. These increases are merely automatic reallocations and increases in salary under the classification law. We have simply carried out the law and made these additional appropriations to comply with the law. It would be an overturning of the law if we did not allow the increases.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It appears on page 301 of the Budget that this appropriation carries an increase of seven employees. There has been no justification for this whatever, and it seems to me we ought to adopt the amendment and stop this increase.

Mr. McGROARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGROARTY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 16, line 21, strike out "\$493,770" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000."

Mr. McGROARTY. Mr. Chairman, you have now come to a place in this appropriation bill where this House should be filled, with every Member in his seat and every Member alert and reading every word of the bill under this Indian Bureau appropriation. I sat for 5 months in the past session of the House on a subcommittee of the Committee on Indian Affairs when we held hearings from all sources, executives of the Indian Bureau and the Department of the Interior and Indians themselves from all parts of the United States. Back of this for years and years I have followed the activities of the Indian Bureau with keen interest and close attention. I have written about it, I have protested against it, I know the Indian people and I know what this Bureau has done.

Now, in order to bring it more drastically and more vividly before the minds of the Members of this House I have made what might look to you as an extravagant proposal, that the expenses of the office of the Indian Bureau here in the city of Washington be cut from almost one-half million dollars down to \$25,000. From my knowledge of the situation and of the Indian Bureau and what it does, I believe with all my heart and all my judgment, that \$25,000 is plenty to run this office.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGROARTY. I have just 5 minutes and let me go on, please. This is the only chance I will get, I guess, to take a whack at this thing that I have tried for 40 or 50 years to get a whack at, and let me have it, will you not.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California be given 5 additional minutes. Forty years of waiting is entitled to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from California be extended 5 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGROARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Envisage a harassed Secretary of the Treasury burning the midnight oil, sitting in his chair in the "dog watches" of the night, with cold compresses on his head, wondering where he can get money to meet the appropriations made by this Congress. Here is where we can help this distressed gentleman.

If I could, I would deny all these appropriations to the Indian Bureau. It is an infamous thing. It has blackened the history of this Republic with its dirty fingers for 100 years. If we could abolish the thing, it would do two things. It would take the Indian Bureau off the back of the Government and it would take it off the backs of the Indians. It has never done anything but harm to the Indians, and here comes this impudent proposal in two lines, characteristic of the effrontery of this little, nasty oligarchy that exists in this Government—in two lines, asking for the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and personal expense in the District of Columbia—that is all it says—\$493,770. They ought not to have a cent of it.

They pile up work, they create work. Why, they have 7,300 employees in the Indian Bureau, one for every 40 Indians in the United States. There is nothing like it in any civilized country in the world. It has been damned for 100 years by Presidents of the United States, by Mem-



bers of the Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, and still it defies every attack that was ever made on it and sits snug and serene in its own arrogance.

Think of the Indian people of this country, Mr. Chairman, who have been wronged and outraged and robbed through a century of dishonor, and realize, as I know from the hearings of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Indian Affairs, that this Bureau is no better now than it ever was, and in some ways it is a lot worse. If I had the time I could tell you things here that you would think hard to believe, but which are true; things like when the Commissioner of Indian Affairs wanted to reorganize the Indian schools he sent to Mexico for a man to do it. He sent to the Republic of Mexico for a man who comes from a country where every teacher in every public school has to take an atheistic oath. Nobody in the United States being capable of reorganizing the Indian schools he sent to Mexico; and on the agrarian question, when the lands were to be surveyed and reorganized, he sends to Turkey or Russia for another foreigner. There is nobody in the United States available.

This Indian Bureau is so vile that it makes the blood of an honest American run cold in his veins and brings the blush of shame to his cheeks. Now is the time to quit talking about it and do something to curb these vicious activities.

So I trust the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to cut the amount down a few thousand dollars will give way to my substitute and cut it down to \$25,000. This is plenty for this office in Washington with a Commissioner of Indian Affairs and a few clerks. I can take the few clerks in my office and run the whole business. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from California for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McGROARTY) there were 36 ayes and 21 noes.

Tellers were demanded, and 18 Members rose, not a sufficient number.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members present, a quorum. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], as amended by the substitute by the gentleman from California [Mr. McGROARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were 51 ayes and 28 noes.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present, and object to the vote on that ground.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members present, a quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses of organizing Indian chartered corporations, or other tribal organizations, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat., p. 986), including personal services, purchase of equipment and supplies, not to exceed \$10,000 for printing and binding, and other necessary expenses, \$160,000, of which not to exceed \$41,060 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURDICK: Page 18, line 7, after the word "exceed", strike out "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000"; on page 18, line 8, after the word "expenses" strike out "\$160,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000"; and in line 9, after the word "exceed", strike out "\$41,060."

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of Members to a situation among the Indians to which I believe Congress should pay some attention. It will be recalled that in June 1934, Congress passed an act known as the Wheeler-Howard Act, a reorganization act affecting the

lives and destinies of the American Indians. When the act was presented to the Indians for their ratification, the law was interpreted to be this: Suppose they had 800 Indians capable of voting, and 398 of those Indians voted "no", and 2 of them voted "yes", the Indian Bureau decided that the 2 had won that election, that it took a majority against the act to exclude it; and this Congress in the first session, by unanimous vote, corrected that defect in the bill, which really never existed at all, because it was nothing but an interpretation rather than law. One hundred and sixty thousand dollars is provided in this bill for expenses of securing the approval of the Indians to this act. This provision in the bill I move to strike out, and why? One hundred and sixty thousand dollars for what? One hundred and sixty thousand dollars to keep the Indians stirred up, to keep these agents out among the Indians telling them of the advantages of this New Deal among the Indians, that it is self-government, when it does not mean self-government at all. They are to be governed by a board of business managers, elected by the Indians themselves; but, as it happened in Oregon, if the business managers do not satisfy the Indian Bureau, then the Indian Bureau, through the Department of the Interior, has the right to remove the whole committee, and has done so. So instead of giving the Indians self-government, they have given them more bureaucratic control. One hundred and sixty thousand dollars! The bill provides:

For expenses or organizing Indian chartered corporations, or other tribal organizations, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934.

That refers to the Wheeler-Howard Act. Then for printing, \$10,000.

I am reminded of this situation because I have lived among the Indians for over 50 years. Some people believe that I am one, but if I am it is only through the fact that I have lived with them so long. In 1888 an act was passed in this Congress opening up the Indian reservation for settlement in our territory, and the Indians had to vote upon that subject by a vote of three-fourths of all male Indians over the age of 18 years. When that matter was submitted to the Indians of my territory, they voted "no." They did not want to open up their reservation. But what happened? As soon as that vote was recorded this Indian Bureau, their agents and employees, were put to work in that territory, their employees and all of them, and hordes of speakers went among the Indians and put on another election, and that second election caused the outbreak of the Sioux Indians against the Government of the United States, resulting in the Battles of Grand River and Wounded Knee, all because the Indian Bureau insisted on making them vote again. What have they done in North Dakota again this year? The Indians voted to go into the act before they knew what it was, and when it came to adopting rules and regulations, bylaws, they said "no", and they voted last fall "no", but what is the situation today? This Indian Bureau is out there with employees stirring up those Indians, family against family, to get them to vote again on the same thing, and all over this country the Indians are stirred up because of the influence of this Bureau.

I say you were dead wrong when you were appropriating \$160,000 for this Indian Bureau to stir up more trouble among the American Indians. I say to you that \$10,000 is enough. The Indians have a right to know what an act is and the Bureau has a right to tell them, but they have not the right to send hordes of speakers and employees out there. Do you know that the Department of the Interior has sent a letter out to every employee of the Indian Bureau actually threatening them with dismissal from the service if they opposed the act or advised their people to oppose it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. No; you need not do that. I move to strike out the last word.



Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman cannot do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion. I do not know very much about the Indian matters in this appropriation bill, but I have a sympathy for the Indian, although I have not an Indian in the district which I represent. I feel some responsibility for the asinine action of the committee just a moment ago, and I am speaking rather frankly, because I asked that the lovable gentleman from California [Mr. McGROARTY] have an additional 5 minutes, in which time he could say what he has wanted to say for 40 years and this was the first time he has had a chance to say it, that \$25,000 is enough to administer Indian affairs rather than \$496,000. It was the opinion of the committee that one of the Members would answer the gentleman from California, because there is an answer to it, but that Member thought some other Member was going to answer it and through inadvertence no answer was made.

As far as the Indians are concerned, in 1832 our Government, under and after solemn treaty to the contrary, took every Indian from east of the Mississippi by armed force, thousands of them, in the dead of winter, and dropped them in Oklahoma, and that is the reason Oklahoma has so many Indians today.

The white man stole this country from the Indians, gave them diseases of all kinds, tried to get them to emulate his way, and now they are suffering from tuberculosis and everything else. Then the kind gentleman from California [Mr. McGROARTY] says, "Now, the poor creatures, let us take the Indian Bureau off their backs and let them take care of themselves", when they are no longer able to do so. [Applause in the gallery.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. There seems to be some confusion in the gallery.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Oh, that is all right. I have no objection to it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But it invades the privileges of the House. I make the point of order that the privileges of the House have been invaded. I do not know who it was, but the Doorkeeper should certainly look into the proposition.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, at this time I ask unanimous consent that I have an additional 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Oh, you would object.

Mr. HOOK. Yes; I will object.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. My time has not yet expired.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. HOOK. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Now, Mr. Chairman, as far as this appropriation is concerned, that speech of Mr. McGROARTY might have been proper 3 or 4 years ago, when under the allotment plan they were stealing the land from the Indians and taking it away from them, robbing and exploiting them, aided by the Government, but under the present plan they are trying to rehabilitate them so that they can help themselves and get off the back of the Government.

Then the kind, sympathetic gentleman from California [Mr. McGROARTY] comes and says, "Let us not let them do it." You know. Save money, just the same as the watchdog of the Treasury over there. Penny-wise and pound-foolish. Were you serious or were you clowning?

Mr. McGROARTY. Oh, you will burst a blood vessel.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Oh, no; I will not burst a vein.

Mr. McGROARTY. Do not get mad about it.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I am not mad. I am a little warmed up. I resent it when five gentlemen who have Indians in their districts vote as they did on the previous amendment just because they want to demonstrate their ill will against our Indian Commissioner. They would cut off their noses to spite their faces. As to the gentleman from California, when he learns the true facts of the Indian situation he will regret his hasty and ill-advised action in submitting

that amendment and will be the first to admit his mistake.

The present amendment is the same type as the one just passed. It is my hope that the Members present will be big enough and fair enough to do right and vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the particular amendment under consideration is an amendment affecting Indians exclusive of my State. At the time the Wheeler-Howard Act was adopted by this Congress, Oklahoma was excepted from its provisions, and very wisely so, I think, by reason of the fact that the then representatives of that State thought that the provisions of the bill did not fit the situation of our Indians.

Only a minute ago I walked into the Chamber when the appropriation of \$493,770 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs was cut to \$25,000. Some of you Members who voted for that appropriation, I presume, did so because you felt that you were taking a cut at some of the personnel in the Indian Office itself. I presume you voted for that appropriation because you wanted to punish the Commissioner of Indian Affairs or the Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs or somebody else. I want to say this to you, that probably you did punish them some, but they will be the last to suffer. If you leave any appropriation here, those boys will get their salaries, no doubt; so that you have punished the Indians of this Nation, the Indians with whom your Government many years ago negotiated treaties to reimburse and protect them for the right and privilege of occupying and improving and taking the land which was theirs.

Mr. McGROARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. The gentleman is not speaking to the amendment.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. KVALE. In line with the gentleman's timely observation, will he ask the Committee for unanimous consent to reconsider the frivolous and very ill-timed action which it took, to which he refers?

Mr. NICHOLS. No; I will not, because I could not get unanimous consent, and I do not think it makes any difference, because I think we will put it back in when we get back into the House.

Now, let me address my remarks to this particular appropriation for a moment. I do not know whether it is so frivolous or not, despite the fact that it does not apply to Oklahoma. Do you know what they are attempting to do with these funds? Do you know what they are attempting to do under the Wheeler-Howard Act? They are attempting to take the poor Indian and put him back on land so that he will become self-supporting and self-sustaining. Of course, I see a smug grin on the face of some of my distinguished Republican colleagues from the industrial North and the financial East, who do not have any Indians in their districts, nor do they care what becomes of any of them.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is mistaken. As a matter of fact, on Manhattan Island we have a tribe of Indians, a very famous and historic tribe known as the Tammany Indians, and my objection to this bill is that we make no appropriation for that tribe of Indians. As a matter of fact, they need more help now than ever before, especially since their big chief with the brown derby has decided to take a walk. [Laughter.]

Mr. NICHOLS. I was not referring to the gentleman from New York, but if he were grinning I am sorry I did not see him. I really was not referring to him. As for the big chief in the brown derby, he may keep walking until his feet are worn to stumps before his actions or statements will have any effect on the vote cast by the rank and file of the people of this Nation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman's remarks about the industrial East are not correct, because some of us from that section voted for and will continue to vote for these appropriations. I think the gentleman ought to correct his statement in this regard.



Mr. NICHOLS. No doubt my statement was too general in its terms. Certainly I do not want to alienate any Member who did go along with it; I do not want to do an injustice to him.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman could not alienate me, but such a message as that contained in the gentleman's statement sent out to these good people might have the effect of making them feel that the industrial East was against them.

Mr. NICHOLS. I do not want to do any injustice, neither do I want this House, in the spirit that was evidenced a minute ago, to do irreparable damage to the Indians of this Nation. That is what is being done by these amendments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, happen to come from a district that has two Indian reservations in it. I happen to have been born and raised in the Northern Peninsula of Michigan and to have worked on an Indian reservation in northern Wisconsin. I happened to see the ravages of the Indian Bureau that took away from those Indians every cent the Government ever appropriated for their benefit. I saw the actions of the Indian Bureau and its agents in the past result in the loss of millions of feet of white pine and Norway pine and millions of dollars, leaving those unfortunate people destitute and at the mercy of unscrupulous exploiters.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. When; what year?

Mr. MAVERICK. What year was that?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The gentleman cannot answer that.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield.

Mr. Chairman, I resent the attack that was made on the gentleman who had nerve enough to stand up here and fight to cut down the appropriation of the autocratic Indian Bureau. I resent the attack that was personally made upon him. I resent the fact that any man or any Member of this House would sarcastically refer to another bill that probably is not quite so popular, which I think I shall vote against, to try to arouse this House against the good work of this gentleman from the West, the gentleman from California [Mr. McGROARTY].

I want to call attention to the fact that I believe some appropriations should be made for the Indian Bureau, but I believe also that we should cut down the enormous amount of money that has been appropriated to them and which they have squandered in the name of the Indian. I believe it is about time that we as Members of this House not only cut down on the appropriations for that Bureau but also on appropriations that have been allotted to a good many of the other bureaus. [Applause.]

I think that when gentlemen of the caliber of our colleague from California, Mr. McGROARTY, take this floor that they should not be personally slandered from this floor. When we have nerve enough to stand up here and tell these bureaucrats administering Indian affairs that they are not going to act in the high-handed manner in which they have been acting for a great many years past we shall probably get some efficiency from that Bureau and the Indians will get something with the money that is being appropriated by this Congress.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Can the gentleman tell us how many of Mr. Collier's relatives and family are employed in that Bureau and drawing down big salaries?

Mr. HOOK. I do not know.

Mr. MAVERICK. How long ago was it that the gentleman saw these abuses of the Indian Bureau to which he called attention?

Mr. HOOK. I have seen it from 1909 right up until the present time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I get mighty tired hearing indiscriminate talk about bureaucracy and Members talking about it in a general and vague way without any facts on which to base their conclusions. Now, I have not any specific information concerning the Indian Bureau except what I have seen.

Personally I think Mr. Collier, whom I have met only once, is a pretty good man. I went through the Indian pueblos in New Mexico and Arizona this summer and I saw some of the finest work that is being done in the United States in the way of preventing soil erosion and the general work of conservation. They have put up dams in certain places and fences in others; and you will see where the Indian land is being built up and growing grass, but you will see the white man's land is going down, going to ruin.

Another thing you will see in this Indian reservation for these people who have been suffering for 5 years, and maybe 50 years, dentists going there and fixing the teeth of the Indian children. Health in general is being improved and protected. Now for the first time in a great many years the Indians are having a square deal.

As far as I am concerned, I think Harold L. Ickes knows and understands the Indian question, and I believe the Department of the Interior and the Indian Bureau are doing a good job. [Applause.] I do not know whether the Indian Bureau needs all of this money or not, but I presume the Committee on Appropriations has given it their attention and intelligent consideration. To come up here and say that we are going to cut something from \$160,000 to \$10,000 without any scientific consideration is just absolutely criminal foolishness. It is utterly crazy. I think we ought to leave it as it is, and the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Authorization for attending health and educational meetings: Not to exceed \$7,000 shall be available from applicable funds for expenses (not membership fees) of employees of the Indian Service when authorized by the Secretary of the Interior to attend meetings of medical, health, educational, agricultural, forestry, engineering, and industrial associations in the interest of work among the the Indians.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk. This amendment merely corrects a typographical error. The word "the" appears twice, once at the end of line 16 and at the beginning of the line 17. My amendment cuts out one of the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Page 19, at the beginning of line 17, strike out the word "the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the acquisition of lands, interest in lands, water rights and surface rights to lands, and for expenses incident to such acquisition, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat., p. 985), including personal services, purchase of equipment and supplies, and other necessary expenses, \$1,000,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1936, of which not to exceed \$30,540 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That within the States of Arizona and Wyoming no part of said sum shall be used for the acquisition of lands outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated the Secretary of the Interior may also incur obligations, and enter into contracts for the acquisition of additional land, not exceeding a total of \$1,000,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment



of the cost thereof, and appropriations hereafter made for the acquisition of land pursuant to the authorization contained in the act of June 18, 1934, shall be available for the purpose of discharging the obligation or obligations so created.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. TABER: On page 23, line 8, strike out line 8, page 23, to page 24, line 4, inclusive.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, there are about \$2,000,000 involved in this paragraph which will come out of the Treasury of the United States. This entire thing means the purchase of \$2,000,000 of land. I have gone over the hearings in connection with this matter, appearing on page 771 and subsequent pages, and I can see no justification whatever for this appropriation. There is no evidence whatever that these Indians have not plenty of land on which they can work if they desire to work. There is no evidence to show that they cannot get along with what they have. There is no evidence that this proposition will do anything more than just spend the money of the Treasury of the United States uselessly and to no good purpose whatever.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not begin we shall never stop spending money. I hope the Members of the House will adopt this amendment and save the Treasury of the United States \$2,000,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this section embodies the whole principle and purpose of the Wheeler-Howard Act. It provides for the acquisition of land, water rights, surface rights, and other property rights that are necessary for the rehabilitation of the Indians. It is a tremendously important section and necessarily does involve a large amount of money. But I feel that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is very earnestly and honestly trying to do something worth while for all the Indians. We do not all agree with some of his methods or ideas. I did not approve of that act. That is, I feared its administration might do more harm than good. At the same time I feel that we ought not to recklessly and impetuously destroy an act that Congress passed after long consideration and which the Commissioner is now in the process of administering. It would be as utterly wrong as it was to adopt the previous amendment. If we are going to deliberately repeal the Wheeler-Howard Act and throw all these matters into a scrap heap and go back to where we were before, this is the route to take.

I think we should uphold the Interior Department, uphold the Administration, uphold the action of Congress and the action of the Appropriations Committee last year and this year. It seems to me some gentlemen are making a mountain out of a molehill in connection with some of these items. The real question involved here is whether or not you want to destroy the whole Indian Service and wipe out the Commissioner's office. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAVERICK. Is this money to be used out in Arizona and New Mexico for the assistance of the Navajo Indians?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It is for all the Indians. The Navajos are the largest tribe.

Mr. MAVERICK. Does it not include the Navajo Tribe, which has increased 10 times in number, and does it not take care of land that has been overgrazed, and does it not provide for a situation where these people are going to starve to death unless proper conservation methods go through?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAVERICK. Then there will be a drain on the public purse unless we protect these Indians?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; unless we can make it possible for these Indians to become self-supporting by giving them land and stock, and seed, and the necessary implements, water rights, and opportunities of helping them get on their feet, we will have to let them die or feed them

on a dole. I feel this is a constructive provision that we ought to keep in the bill.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is there any evidence that these Indians have become self-supporting as a result of this legislation?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. A sufficient time has not elapsed to find out how it will work. They have hardly got started going yet.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. What proportion of the Indians are taking advantage of the Wheeler-Howard Act?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Two hundred and seventy-six tribes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I understand a large number of the various Indian tribes are in process of organizing—not all of them.

Mr. PIERCE. All of Oklahoma is exempt; all of Oregon is out and practically all of Washington.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The hearings show the situation. Of course, there are hundreds of tribes of Indians and they all have different conditions, different characteristics, different treaty rights, and different property rights.

Mr. PIERCE. I just wondered how many have taken advantage of this act.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. About one-third of all of them are located in Oklahoma. The rest are scattered around over about 20 States.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question on that point?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. Is it not true that a law of this magnitude, with its complexity of administrative problems, cannot get into its stride in the space of a few months?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Certainly. These offered amendments are intended to destroy the law before it can be put into operation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I am not familiar with this appropriation bill, and it was not my purpose to take any part in the debate upon it, but there seems to be some little element of passion and feeling engendered in the discussion of these items that I do not think ought to sway or impel the judgment of the members of the committee.

Now, what is the proposition advanced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in his amendment? Here is a bill that was considered for a number of years by the Congress of the United States. We had some sharp issues upon its merits before it was passed. It was the judgment of the Congress and of the Executive that it was a bill that ought to be put into operation, and in due course the Bureau of the Budget, in order to carry out the provisions of the measure in an orderly fashion, sent to the Appropriations Committee these estimates.

I fully agree with the chairman of the subcommittee that, certainly, it is not the proper method of filing objections to the administration of a bill to take the indirect method of seeking to emasculate its operation by striking out the appropriation. This, in a measure, is a left-handed attack upon the wisdom of the legislation itself.

This appropriation is justified by all the rules of appropriation bills. The bill was duly passed and is in operation. I am no special pleader for the Indians. I know nothing about them; I have none of them in my section of the country, but they are dependent upon this appropriation to carry out an act of Congress, and certainly it seems to me it would be acting in bad faith to them for a member of the Appropriations Committee here, without any opportunity to be heard with reference to the merits of the matter, to strike out the whole appropriation which is intended to carry out the provisions of what I regard to be a humanitarian measure, whether it is wise in all its aspects or not; and I trust



the committee will sustain the Committee on Appropriations in making these items available for carrying out the purposes of the bill.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BANKHEAD. I may say to my friend from Oregon I am not familiar with the details of the measure, but I am discussing the propriety of providing the necessary appropriations to effectuate an act of Congress.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I voted against the Howard bill. I did so intentionally and knowingly on the advice of the Indians in my district. There are three tribes of very intelligent Indians in my district. I am well acquainted with them and many of them are highly educated and talented. They have all rejected the Howard Act by their votes.

I am going to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from New York. It seems to me the committee should have specified where this money is to be spent and on what reservation and given us some knowledge which we are unable to obtain from the hearings. Many people who ought to know do not have a high regard for the competence of the Indian Bureau.

There is one small tribe of less than 200 Indians living in my State, out on the garbage ground of the little city of Burns, in central Oregon. For months we have been trying to have those Indians moved about 2 miles to some land in the valley, so they might milk their own cows and gather their own eggs and help to take care of themselves. These little houses, built a couple of miles away from the land that was finally purchased, are still standing out there among the garbage cans and I do not know how much the Indian Bureau has spent in inspecting this piece of land and trying to arrange for the removal. I do know that trip after trip has been made, by air and otherwise, going out there to look the land over. I intend to learn how many thousands have been spent without result. They have had the counsel of the Indian agents at the different agencies in Oregon until the Bureau has just worn out the patience of everyone trying to help them carry out the proposition in anything like a businesslike way. If they are going to spend this \$2,000,000 in the way the Bureau spent \$20,000 at Burns you can depend upon half of it being wasted.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the Wheeler-Howard Act extends only in part at the present time to the Territory of Alaska, and may I say that I probably represent as many Indians as almost any other Member in Congress, since there are 30,000 of them—Indians and Eskimos and Aleuts—residing in my Territory.

Before proceeding further, let me pay a deserved tribute, if I may, to the operation of the Office of Indian Affairs in Alaska. In Alaska, within my personal knowledge, the Bureau, or Office, of Indian Affairs has never become involved in partisan politics but has operated for the benefit of the natives, but with an improved and increasing efficiency as the years have passed. And in fairness and justice I must say that the present administration has worked wholeheartedly for the benefit of the Territory which I represent in Congress. During my tenure of office as Delegate from Alaska, while I may not have agreed upon every point of policy with the officials of the Bureau, I am confident that they have always acted with a single mind for the benefit of my native constituents. The Alaska office of the Indian Affairs Bureau is becoming increasingly efficient, and my prayer is that no backward step be taken now to destroy that efficiency and the service we are receiving. If the Indian Bureau is destroyed—and that seems to be the object of some of the Members of this body—I fear and almost despair of the welfare of my native friends in Alaska. They are the ones who will suffer most, not the employees or the officials of the Bureau in Washington.

Somehow I am unable to believe that the membership of this House wishes to abolish the Indian Bureau at one fell

swoop. Of course, I have heard the reports of the distant past, as to which it was said that the Bureau was the official agency through which the white people were enabled to legally despoil the Indians. But I have no personal knowledge of such matters. I do know that at the present time, and in Washington as well as in Alaska, I find, and have found, since I have been Delegate in Congress from Alaska, a most heartening disposition on the part of the officials of the Office of Indian Affairs to help and aid my native Alaska friends in every possible manner. Somehow I am unable to believe that in their actions in other parts of the United States the officials and employees of the Indian Bureau are either fools or satans faintly disguised. Let us remember that with one exception no human being has ever achieved the crowning glory of perfection. Unless we are unduly sanguine, we shall admit that we all may make mistakes.

When the Wheeler-Howard Act was passed—or rather, was in course of passage—I sought to have the provisions relating to economic benefits and to educational aid extended to Alaska. With this view the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Collier, was most sympathetic and helpful. Accordingly the bill as passed by the House and a companion bill, or perhaps the same bill, as passed by the Senate, adequately covered Alaska. But in conference, through what was evidently an oversight, Alaska was omitted from a large portion of the benefits of the act. That should now be corrected. You will understand that I was not a member of the conference committee of the House and the Senate on the bill, and hence I was unable to prevent the inadvertent mistake which was made with reference to Alaska.

The Wheeler-Howard Act, as I have said, extends only in part to Alaska, but I have introduced and am pressing for passage as forcibly as I can a bill which will extend the entire act to the Territory of Alaska. I do it because the best organized body of Indians in Alaska have held a convention and have decided that the Wheeler-Howard Act offers the only possible opportunity for them to become self-supporting and to raise their economic status.

The Wheeler-Howard Act means not only funds to provide food and clothing, which would only last for a day or a year, it means money to put them in a position where they can help themselves. We are trying to help them, and this act is the wisest step ever taken, to my knowledge, for the benefit of the Indians not only in the United States but in the Territory of Alaska. [Applause.]

It would be a terrible, a tragic mistake, to sustain the motion of the gentleman from New York and thus cut out funds which are designed to be used in carrying out the provisions of the Wheeler-Howard Act. If this is done, it would have been better not to have enacted this statute at all. From a legislative standpoint I suggest that the lucid and convincing argument of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. BANKHEAD] which he has just expressed is unanswerable. But from the more important standpoint of human right, and human justice, and human need, the position of those of us who oppose the proposed amendment and support the appropriation is still more unassailable. We are dealing with the permanent welfare of human beings, not mere legislative abstractions or legislative policies. Are we so fickle and so lacking in calm and considered judgment as to pass a law one day and on the next cast it into the outer darkness?

The Wheeler-Howard Act has not even been tried out. There has not been time to try it out. That was clearly indicated in the question asked by the able gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE] who is always solicitous of the rights of those who are relatively poor in this world's goods, and the answer given by the brilliant and beloved chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. TAYLOR. The Wheeler-Howard Act was passed by both Houses of the Congress and signed by the President, and it is the law of the land. It was passed so recently that the signatures are scarcely dried on the enrolled bill. But apparently because it has not already accomplished positive miracles, an attempt is now being made to prevent being put into operation its most promising benefits for the Indians of the Nation.



Few voices were raised when the Indians were being robbed of their heritage. Why should we be now so solicitous to prevent what I am confident is an intelligent and an honest attempt to restore to the children in a small way, in a feeble way, a little portion of the equivalent of the patrimony of their fathers.

I know what has happened in Alaska. The white men have come in and they have taken over almost everything with scant, if any, regard for the property or other rights of the natives. The Indians and Eskimos and Aleuts have simply been all but crowded out, the result not so much of malice as of careless selfishness. These native people are kindly, they are generous, they are intelligent. I have lived in Alaska many years. It is my home. At the end of my span of life I hope to be buried there. I have traveled extensively over the Territory, particularly during the years when I was a prospector, and never in all of my journeys have I met with anything but hospitality and kindness from the native Eskimos and Indians and Aleuts of Alaska. If to love one's neighbor as himself is a virtue the natives of Alaska possess that virtue. Let us give them a chance to build up their own domestic economy and thus gain the self-respect and spiritual development which always accompany, within reasonable limits, an improved economic condition.

As I pointed out in remarks which I made on the floor of the House on January 28 of this year, Alaska is paying her own way, and the Territory is the Nation's greatest undeveloped resource. With respect to the native inhabitants of Alaska, it must be said that the present white residents of the Territory have benefited little, if at all, by the losses suffered by the natives. The natives have lost their well-recognized rights and claims to the lands, to the fisheries, and to the wild game, and the furs. But generally all of those rights of property have fallen into the hands of persons who do not reside in Alaska. This is especially true with respect to rights as to the fisheries. This does not affect our obligation to do justice to the natives. We can do justice in only one practicable way, and that is in furnishing them sufficient financial assistance under the Wheeler-Howard Act to give them a fair degree of economic security. Adopt the proposed amendment, and you again rob my friends of hope.

May I repeat, that the adoption of the proposed amendment, and the consequent elimination of the item of appropriation for carrying out the Wheeler-Howard Act, would be a lamentable mistake. This piece of progressive and humanitarian legislation would be blasted before there is even afforded a chance to try it out. I am unable to believe that Congress will follow such a course.

The distinguished and lovable gentleman from California [Mr. McGROARTY], has secured the adoption of another amendment which, if it stays in the bill, will substantially abolish the Office of Indian Affairs. Again I am unable to convince myself that the House will adopt this policy. But if the House tomorrow or the next day, when the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reports this bill back to the House, adopts the McGROARTY amendment, and the amendment now under consideration, then we shall have the melancholy distinction of having participated in an act which has brought to a sad climax, a disgraceful culmination, the "century of dishonor" which has marked, and indeed, encompassed the relations of the white races of the United States with its original native inhabitants, for we will have taken away from our Indian citizens, including the Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts of Alaska, the only fair opportunity to help themselves which they have been afforded in my generation. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount to be added to the appropriation of \$2,500,000 contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936, for the establishment of a revolving fund for the purpose of making loans to Indian chartered corporations, in accordance with the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat., p. 986), \$980,000, of which amount not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, for purchase of equipment and supplies, and for other necessary expenses of administering such loans.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 29, line 18, strike out line 18, page 29, to line 2, page 30, inclusive.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to save \$980,000 to the Treasury of the United States. Under the Wheeler-Howard Act an appropriation of \$2,500,000 a year, as I understand it, was authorized for the purpose of making loans to Indian chartered corporations. No such loans have been made down to the time of the hearings on this bill, and the committee cut the Budget estimate of \$2,500,000 to \$980,000. No such loans have been made; no such corporations have been organized down to the time of the hearings. I refer the Members to the report of the committee on page 7:

Loans cannot be made until charters are issued, and none had been issued at the time of the hearings on the bill. As the issuance of charters is a condition prerequisite to the making of loans, the progress made to date would indicate that the amount recommended will be entirely sufficient for the next fiscal year.

The situation is this. They have available the two million and a half dollars which was appropriated a year ago, and they do not need it because they have nothing to loan to, and \$980,000 carried in paragraph is unnecessary. I believe we ought to save that amount for the Treasury instead of appropriating the money.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the reason the full appropriation has not been made is that it requires considerable time to organize the Indians into chartered corporations. The money has not been needed up to the present time. The entire two and a half million dollars will be needed in addition to the \$980,000 provided for. Your committee has gone into this very thoroughly. We have examined all the circumstances and we believe it to be necessary.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. And the original act calls for \$5,000,000, and this is much less.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 15, noes 33.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For operation and maintenance of the San Carlos project for the irrigation of lands in the Gila River Indian Reservation, Ariz., \$98,750, reimbursable, together with \$99,250 (operation and maintenance collections) and \$106,000 (power revenues), of which latter sum not to exceed \$25,000 shall be available for major repairs in case of unforeseen emergencies caused by fire, flood, or storm, from which amounts expenditures shall not exceed the aggregate receipts covered into the Treasury in accordance with section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934; in all, \$304,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado for the committee: Page 33, line 10, after the word "amounts", insert "of \$99,250 and \$106,000, respectively."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this is a clarifying amendment. It does not change the total amount. It changes the phraseology in a way we felt necessary to make it clear and make the appropriation available.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For operation and maintenance of the irrigation systems on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont., \$12,000, reimbursable, together with \$80,000 (operation and maintenance collections) and \$45,000 (power revenues), from which amounts expenditures shall not exceed the aggregate receipts covered into the Treasury in accordance with section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934; in all, \$137,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.



The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Page 35, line 14, after the word "amounts", insert "of \$80,000 and \$45,000, respectively."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, that is for the purpose of clarifying the phraseology as in the last amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read down to and including line 4, on page 39.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOUGHTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10630, the Interior Department appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 459) entitled "Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the Texas Centennial Exposition and celebrations to be held in the State of Texas during the years 1935 and 1936, and authorizing the President to invite foreign countries and nations to participate therein, and for other purposes.'"

#### THE CASE OF HOOVER VERSUS THE FARMER

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, coming from an agricultural State, Nebraska, and having been engaged in farming for many years myself, I am deeply impressed at this time with two vital needs: One, a satisfactory and workable substitute for the Agricultural Adjustment Act; the other, the need for accurate understanding of the present agricultural problem, without which no satisfactory program can be built.

Such an understanding must exist, not only in the three branches of our Government—executive, legislative, and judicial—but also in the minds of the people, who, in the final analysis, are the highest tribunal in the land. This tribunal of 125,000,000 justices is vitally concerned with the general welfare. These justices are appointed for life by virtue of their citizenship. This is the court which never recesses and which, in our Government of checks and balances, writes the final majority or minority opinion—public opinion, if you please.

It is true that justice in this highest tribunal is sometimes slow. Legal technicians may delay the final verdict. Misrepresentation of facts or short-sighted leadership may confuse the deliberations and prolong the delay, perhaps for generations. That has been done. But an enlightened and accurately informed public opinion will in the end guard the general welfare.

Some time ago in my home city, Lincoln, an address was delivered by Herbert Hoover, the former President of the United States. Since in that address Mr. Hoover attempted to assail the present administration's farm program and also attempted to point out "roads to relief", I feel impelled to make a few observations. I do this, not in the spirit of personal or party criticism, but for the reason that the record may be kept straight. I rise to the defense of American agriculture.

I was deeply gratified to note the extent to which Mr. Hoover, during the period for reflection which has been his these past 3 years, now embraces many of the fundamental policies which are inherent in the philosophies and practices

of the New Deal's agriculture program. His adoption of these principles, during this period given him for unburdened contemplation by a considerate Nation following his 12 years of official service ending in those trying days of March 1933, is all the more notable in view of his record during those years of his official life.

Let me review some points expressed in his Lincoln speech:

First. With the rest of us, Mr. Hoover pleads for increased consumption of foods to be brought about by restoring employment. It had become fully apparent that cheap food, as represented by \$3 hogs, \$4 cattle, 20-cent corn, and 30-cent wheat, would not solve this problem, because, in the face of these prices, the supplies of these commodities had piled up until they were the largest in our history, untaken by our consumers at any price.

It was not cheapness of foods that would do the trick. That much was apparent. One of the aims and problems of the Triple A was to bring about reemployment in the factories through revived farm-buying power. A prostrate agriculture could not buy industrial goods in 1932. Industry has always practiced "production control", which means producing only what can be sold at a profit, even if it requires "plowing up" half or more of the factory acres, or plowing laborers out into the ranks of the unemployed. The farmer, finding no market and receiving a below-cost-of-production price, found himself confronted with ruin and the inability to buy even the mere necessities of life. This restricted buying power went far toward the aggravation of the unemployment problem. The challenge was to restore farm-buying power by increasing farm income so that laborers, again at work in the factories, could once more buy food at fair prices. Mr. Hoover neglected to mention the fact that by 1935 farm-buying power increased 50 to 55 percent over that of 1932. This brought an unquestioned amount of employment to industry. Consumption of practically all farm products was greater in 1935 than in 1932. Consumption of flour was apparently somewhat less in 1935 than 1932, but flour consumption has been steadily declining since 1926. It continued its decline at about the same rate as it did in the years of Mr. Hoover's administration.

Meat consumption fell about 10 percent in 1935, but several things need be considered. Our supply of pork is always consumed at some price, even though our farmers may almost give it away. But I know that neither hog producers or consumers want to go back to the 1932 price conditions, not even for an extra strip of bacon in ten. Such a condition of almost giving pork away to get people to eat it was making the farmer carry the relief load single handedly. The other factor to be considered was the drought. Mr. Hoover, as a relief expert, well knows the effect of disaster on the diet and food supplies. He knows from those saddening experiences how truly remarkable it was that following our 1934 drought—the worst in our history—our food supplies and consumption were not cut down to the scarcity level and that farm prices did not reach the parity level. The criticism of a 10-percent decline in meat consumption following 1932, when our farmers practically gave meat away, is certainly unjust.

Second. Mr. Hoover asks for our own home market for our farmer, and the restoration of a reasonable export market. How different this present situation might have been had Mr. Hoover recognized this fundamental principle when he was in a position to do something about it. Instead, he allowed and encouraged just the opposite. Today everyone in the New Deal joins with Mr. Hoover in this fervent wish for our home and export market and in his regrets for having lost so much of them during the years before 1933.

Mr. Hoover did not point out that during the last 10 years of his own public life, ending in 1933, our pork exports to foreign countries fell by the equivalent of more than 8,000,000 head of hogs annually. That is more hogs that we produce annually in the whole hog-producing State of Nebraska! He neglects to mention that during the same period of his official life, before 1933, our wheat exports showed an almost steady decline from 254,000,000 bushels in 1924 to 124,000,000 in 1931 and 25,000,000 in 1933. That is a loss



of more than 200,000,000 bushels of export a year during 10 years of Mr. Hoover's administration. That is more wheat than we grow in the whole State of Nebraska in 3 years! I ask that those who are straining at a gnat in deploring our export-import situation today, following the drought, remember the Smoot-Hawley tariff and other causes which combined to cost us the major part of our once lucrative export market and brought us up to 1933 with that export market all but gone completely. Our total agricultural exports declined much more during the period before 1933 than they did later; that is, they declined much more during the Hoover regime than during the New Deal regime. This is clearly illustrated by showing the value of all agricultural exports from 1925 to date, expressed in billions of dollars:

	Billions of dollars
1925-----	2.3
1926-----	1.9
1927-----	1.9
1928-----	1.8
1929-----	1.8
1930-----	1.5
1931-----	1.0
1932-----	.8
1933-----	.6
1934-----	.8
1935-----	.8

These illuminating figures would certainly not be comforting to one who was in power up to the low export point, 1933. No wonder Mr. Hoover now asks for a restoration of our export market. The farmers should be warned, however, that it will be a slow process to overcome the various factors which produced this export decline during Mr. Hoover's regime. Some progress was made during the drought year but not enough to overcome the greater tragedy of the short-sighted statesmanship which caused the decline.

Just to make the facts still more convincing, let me remind anyone who joins with Mr. Hoover and with me in deploring the debacle of our lost exports during the Hoover era that, expressed in terms of quantity instead of value, and using the 1909-14 period as an index of 100, our total agricultural exports, except cotton, showed an almost steady decline from an index of 218 in 1922 to 64 in 1933.

And this brings us to cotton. Mr. Hoover says:

We will take that worst year (1932) and compare it with the New Deal year of 1935. From that worst year exports of cotton have decreased 4,250,000 bales.

This was apparently based upon the data for the 1931-32 crop year beginning August 1, as compared with 1934-35. Mr. Hoover has deplored the decrease in number of bales—and he is only a little high—but let us look at the value, the returns to the Nation and to our farmers. The declared value of exports and unmanufactured cotton for the crop year 1934-35 was \$328,000,000 for 5,000,000 bales, as compared with \$342,000,000 for 9.2 million bales during Mr. Hoover's year of 1931-32. I ask this high court of public opinion which is the better record? Incidentally, the two largest consecutive cotton-export years on record were 1931-32 and 1932-33 when we exported 18,000,000 bales of cotton—but the other side of that picture is that the farm price of cotton for those 2 years was 5.5 and 6.5 cents per pound—which is, of course, below the cost of production and the lowest price in this century. Yet Mr. Hoover deplores the fact that "from that worst year—1932—exports of cotton have decreased 4,250,000 bales." Naturally foreign buyers loaded up their supplies for the future when they could buy it at record low prices.

Third. Mr. Hoover would retire submarginal lands. This is being done at a moderate rate.

Fourth. Mr. Hoover advocates further strengthening of the farm-credit machinery. This, of course, has been strengthened under this administration far more than under any previous administration.

Fifth. Mr. Hoover would "encourage cooperative marketing and those marketing agreements which contribute to prevent gluts in the flow to market." There are now in effect under the original adjustment act marketing agreements and

licenses, or licenses alone, for 28 fluid-milk marketing areas, in addition to those for the dry skimmed-milk industry and the evaporated-milk industry and for the 12 fruit and vegetable industries. It has been the policy under these agreements to move the surpluses into regular or nonroutine commercial channels. I do not blame Mr. Hoover for wanting to prevent gluts in the flow to market following his disastrous glut that was heard around the world when his Farm Board was caught with huge quantities of wheat and cotton they could not unload.

Sixth. Mr. Hoover says that—

We should endeavor to expand another crop which can be marketed or which would improve the fertility of the soil \* \* \*. We need to replenish our soil with legumes and restore coverages.

The Triple A programs have done exactly that. They have not only encouraged the planting of soil-improving and erosion-preventing crops but have required it in positive performance asked for in contracts. Estimates based on reports from the land-grant colleges and experiment stations show that more than 90 percent of the 35,000,000 acres in 1934, and 30,000,000 acres in 1935, that were shifted from the production of surplus crops were used for soil-improving and erosion-preventing crops, or constructive fallow to conserve moisture and control weeds, planting farm wood lots, or for other purposes in which Mr. Hoover would by nature be equally interested, namely, for the production of emergency forage crops in the drought year and for crops for home feed and feed use. Alfalfa production for the Nation increased by 15 percent in 1935 over 1934; soybean acreage by nearly 300 percent in 1935 over the average acreage from 1928 to 1932, and lespedeza acreage increased more than twofold. The total pasture crop, according to census report, increased by 19,000,000 acres in the cotton States, or 15 percent. The hay and forage crops increased by 4,600,000 acres, or about 60 percent. Mr. Hoover will be relieved to learn that in the great drought region it is estimated that over 16,000,000 tons of forage crops best suited to meet drought conditions were produced on the acres taken out of production of surplus crops. One of the farmers who lives in my district in Butler County, Nebr., said that he grew more feed in 1934 on his 20 contracted acres taken out of corn production and put in emergency feed than on his 120 acres of land planted to corn on the same farm.

Seventh. Finally, Mr. Hoover, after subscribing now, if somewhat belatedly, to all these things I have mentioned which have been advocated and accomplished by the adjustment programs, lines up with the proposed substitute program when he says:

I believe we must be prepared to subsidize directly such special crops until agriculture has again been brought into balance. At the end of such a road we could hope for a balanced agriculture in full production and increased fertility in our soils. I am advised that it can be done within the spirit as well as the letter of the Constitution.

Apparently Mr. Hoover not only endorses these principles of our past program which I have mentioned but has so seen the light that he wants to go along with the proposed future program.

Now, unfortunately, Mr. Hoover did not confine himself to these constructive suggestions, but went carelessly into some criticism of the New Deal agricultural program, and in his criticism he made some grave misstatements. To keep the record straight before the high court, it seems wise to answer.

First. Mr. Hoover says, "To stop the production of 50,000,000 acres is not progress." Nothing like that was done, in spite of what Mr. Hoover says. In the first place, the curtailment was 36,000,000 acres in 1934 and 30,000,000 acres in 1935, instead of 50,000,000. In the second place, as I have already shown, production was not stopped on those acres. They were used for the highly valuable and constructive purposes which Mr. Hoover himself recommended in another part of his talk. My own farmer friends in Nebraska know this, of course, as do 3,000,000 contracting farmers over the United States, but the rest of the high court to which Mr. Hoover spoke may not have known how inaccurate and misleading his implication was.



Second. Mr. Hoover says this:

The Chicago Tribune is authority for the statement that the farmers' income for many uncontrolled commodities has been greater in proportion than from those which have had the attention of the New Deal.

In the first place, the people of my district know, of course, that the Chicago Tribune is not accepted as an authority on anything agricultural but, on the contrary, is a source of a vast amount of misinformation and discordant statements. I assume Mr. Hoover refers to two editorials I saw in that paper, one entitled "I Found Agriculture Prostrate", and the other "Why Farmers Are More Prosperous", in the December 15, 1935, and September 30, 1935, issues, respectively. The one title, of course, refers to the condition of agriculture when Mr. Hoover turned over his office to his successor, and the other to the present condition of agriculture. The editorial says:

Cash incomes of farmers for 1935 have been estimated at four hundred and thirteen millions larger than a year ago. But the larger part of this increase appears to have come from commodities whose production and prices were not managed by A. A. A.

Now, in the first place, all the farmers in my district of Nebraska, and I assume farmers in general know—even if the Chicago Tribune does not—that because of the competitive effect on each other all grain prices move up or down generally together, and that all livestock prices behave similarly. Were it not that the editorials misrepresented actual facts, I should be glad to let this rather ridiculous suggestion wither in its own weakness before the public judgment. But the editorial says that—

The Government report showed that actual receipts from the sale of grain last year were not more, but less by \$68,000,000 than in the year before. Income from raising hogs, under Government management, fell off by \$4,000,000. Those who live off sugar crops realized \$18,000,000 less than the year before.

The Chicago Tribune ignored completely the rental and benefit payments to farmers. When these are included, grains show not a loss of \$68,000,000, as the Tribune says, but a gain of fifty million; hogs not four million less, as the Tribune says, but actually two hundred million more; sugar crops not eighteen million less, as the Tribune says, but seven million more.

Third. Mr. Hoover quotes President Roosevelt opposing "the shipping of our soil fertility to foreign nations" and declares that "the logical conclusion of all that is to stop exports altogether." He has twisted President Roosevelt's expressed concern over the loss of our soil fertility which results when farmers have to sell at prices so low they cannot afford to maintain the fertility of their farms. An export subsidy that means in effect giving away our soil fertility without financial return is not good policy, nor is it Roosevelt's policy. Secretary Wallace and Administrator Davis have repeatedly urged maintaining our export markets but not unprofitable markets. They do not join with Mr. Hoover in urging maximum export shipments abroad for below-cost-of-production returns, thus subsidizing foreign consumers. If Mr. Hoover wants the home market for the American farmer, should he not be equally considerate of our consumers?

Fourth. Mr. Hoover says:

The execution of these principles required 120,000 part- or full-time Federal officials. Their pay was assessed against the farmers. This new breed of middlemen every day tried hard to bring agriculture into balance with politics.

Mr. Hoover has belittled the farmers of my district and of the United States and ignored the fact that most of them were, instead of being Federal officials, actually farmer committeemen, working a few days and getting a few dollars a day for their service, elected by their neighbors to act for them in an economic democracy functioning in its purest form rather than a bureaucracy in any sense. It made the word "democracy" a word of real significance to the farmers, instead of the mockery it meant in 1932 when their corn went to 20 cents and wheat to 30 cents.

Fifth. Mr. Hoover spoke of unemployment caused by growing less of agricultural crops. This overlooks the far greater amount of employment in industry caused by the

increased farm income. It is true that this greater farm income did not all flow into the industrial market; much of it went to pay interest, overdue principal on farm debt, taxes, and other fixed charges, according to Administrator Davis.

But—

Says Mr. Davis—

diverted to farmers, this income, as the evidence shows, has resulted in a heavy volume of purchases of manufactured goods. Louis Bean, economic advisor to the Adjustment Administration, finds that approximately 40 percent of the 1932-34 increase in factory employment can be attributed to the improvement in rural trade. Sample studies have indicated that in the first year after the farm program was launched shipments of manufactured goods used by farmers in farm production increased 75 percent, and shipments of all industrial and manufactured goods to agricultural areas increased nearly 40 percent.

It took employment to make these additional goods.

Sixth. In reading Mr. Hoover's speech I could not help comparing his present utterances with his past performance during the 12 years he was in power:

All parts of the economic system inevitably come back into balance with time. But farm recovery is longer drawn out. That is the higher economics of it.

The painful symptoms of it appear in the farmer's pocket in the slump of purchasing power of his dollar. Many farmers cannot hold on against these delays in readjustment. I have held that we cannot see the capable and industrious driven from their homes during these periods if they want to make a fight for them.

But over and against these words of Mr. Hoover lie the bitter facts that the various parts of our economic system did not come into balance during the 12 long years when he was in power, and many farmers, including the capable and industrious, could not hold out against the delay in readjustment. The capable and industrious found themselves driven from their homes, and no fine words of Mr. Hoover today can blot out now the memory of what they went through then, nor will they forget. He may ask them to wait yet a few more years, but the people of my district do not want to wait.

Seventh. Finally, Mr. Hoover referred to the era of great fear when the electorate, alarmed apparently at what they had done so enthusiastically, tightened the depression. "Fright over the coming of the New Deal skidded the country into the money and bank panic," he says. But I was interested to read in my Washington Post the next morning—which is published incidentally by Eugene Meyer, who was Governor of the Federal Reserve Board during Mr. Hoover's administration, this statement:

The attempt to saddle the present administration with responsibility for the banking debacle of 1933 and the collapse of the incipient recovery movement of 1932 will not hold water. Fear of New Deal policies was not the cause of a banking weakness of long standing.

Moreover—

Continues Mr. Meyer's newspaper—

Mr. Hoover is significantly silent about the miscarriage of the abortive stabilization efforts of the Farm Board. That ill-fated experiment in agricultural relief should have made him more charitable in judging his successor in office. He also weakens a strong case by an imaginative attack upon the reciprocal tariff policies of the administration, which, he says, are opening up the American market to farmers of Cuba, Canada, Spain, and Italy, with the last two of which no agreement has been concluded.

Mr. Hoover neglected to mention eight other countries with whom reciprocal agreements have been made, while mentioning Spain and Italy, with whom no agreements have been made.

At the outset of his speech Mr. Hoover says the New Deal—

Sets up a glorious ideal with which all of us agree unanimously, and then they drive somewhere else over into the ditch.

I should like to forget, with him, the glorious ideal which he set up of two cars in every garage—both of which were so promptly driven into the ditch.

Our need rises far above the plane of partisan political bias and criticism designed to make the farm problem the playground of politicians greedy for preferment. This problem is a challenge to all of us to forget party strife and to cooperate for a new and better farm program. Few, if any,



contend that the A. A. A. was perfect or that it had no faults. Practically all agree that it was the most salutary step ever taken to meet our farm problem. The mistakes can be discarded and the achievements retained. We have taken a step forward on the road to final solution, and we must not and cannot turn back now. Before this bar of justice I appeal for united support in bringing to our farmers and those dependent upon agriculture a life of economic equality and opportunity based upon the broadest principles of social justice.

#### TEXAS CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION

Mr. McREYNOLDS submitted a conference report on the resolution (H. J. Res. 459) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the Texas Centennial Exposition and celebrations to be held in the State of Texas during the years 1935 and 1936, and authorizing the President to invite foreign countries and nations to participate therein, and for other purposes".

#### ESTIMATE FOR APPROPRIATION FOR ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BACON. Can the Speaker inform the House if and when he intends to lay before the House a recent communication he received from the President on a very important public matter involving over \$2,000,000,000?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is referring to the estimate for payment of the adjusted-service certificates?

Mr. BACON. I was referring to that.

The SPEAKER. That has already been, under the rules, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed.

Mr. BACON. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that it obviously involves raising money that does not now exist in the Treasury, should that not have been sent to the Committee on Ways and Means?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think so, under the Rules of the House. It applies only to an appropriation. No question of taxation is involved in this particular estimate.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Was not the order of the Speaker referring that communication from the President to the Committee on Appropriations, an official order, made here in the House from the Speaker's desk?

The SPEAKER. It was.

Mr. BLANTON. And it is not the fault of anybody in the House other than the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] that he does not keep up with the proceedings of the House?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York, the Chair assumes, simply overlooked it.

#### REPORT FROM NATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE (S. DOC. NO. 167)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Flood Control:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a letter from the Chairman of the National Resources Committee, with the accompanying report, entitled "Little Waters: A Study of Headwater Streams and Other Little Waters: Their Use and Relations to the Land."

This report treats of a subject with which the physical well-being of our people is intimately bound up, yet to which, in the past, too little attention has been paid. We have grown accustomed to dealing with great rivers, with their large problems of navigation, of power and of flood control, and we have been tempted to forget the little rivers from which they come. The report points out that we can have no effective national policy in those matters nor in the closely related matter of proper land uses until we trace this running

water back to its ultimate sources and find means of controlling it and of using it.

Our disastrous floods, our sometimes almost equally disastrous periods of low water, and our major problems of erosion, to which attention has been called by the reports of the National Resources Board, the Mississippi Valley Committee, the Soil Erosion Service, and other agencies, do not come full-grown into being. They originate in a small way, in a multitude of farms, ranches, and pastures.

It is not suggested that we neglect our main streams and give our whole attention to these little waters, but we must have, literally, a plan which will envisage the problem as it is presented in every farm, every pasture, every wood lot, every acre of the public domain.

The Congress could not formulate, nor could the Executive carry out the details of such a plan, even though such a procedure were desirable and possible under our form of government. We can, however, lay down certain simple principles and devise means by which the Federal Government can cooperate in the common interest with the States and with such interstate agencies as may be established. It is for the Congress to decide upon the proper means. Our objective must be so to manage the physical use of the land that we will not only maintain soil fertility but will hand on to the next generation a country with better productive power and a greater permanency of land use than the one we inherited from the previous generation. The opportunity is as vast as is the danger. I hope and believe that the Congress will take advantage of it, and in such a way as to command the enthusiastic support of the States and of the whole public.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 30, 1936.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4178. An act for the relief of the International Manufacturers' Sales Co. of America, Inc., A. S. Postnikoff, trustee.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 31, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Committee on the Public Lands: Friday, January 31, 1936, 10:30 a. m.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Friday, January 31, 1936, on H. R. 4991 and H. J. Res. 247.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

636. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, fiscal years 1936 and 1937, \$2,242,500,000, and for the Treasury Department, fiscal years 1936 and 1937, \$6,678,375, amounting in all to \$2,249,178,375, for the purpose of carrying out the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 402); to the Committee on Appropriations.

637. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a draft of a bill to authorize an appropriation for improvement of ammunition-storage facilities at Aliamanu, Territory of Hawaii, and Edgewood Arsenal, Md.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

638. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a draft of a bill to authorize the acquisition of land for cemetery purposes in the vicinity of New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.



639. A letter from the Secretary of Labor transmitting the report of statistical studies performed by the Department of Labor for other than governmental activities; to the Committee on Labor.

640. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend the act of February 7, 1913, so as to remove restrictions as to the use of the Little Rock Confederate Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

641. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter from the chairman of the National Resources Committee with the accompanying report entitled "Little Waters: A Study of Headwater Streams and Other Little Waters: Their Use and Relations to the Land"; to the Committee on Flood Control.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DARDEN: A bill (H. R. 10750) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey to the city of Norfolk, Va., the old post-office site in such city, and the building thereon, for municipal purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 10751) to further extend the operation of the act entitled "An act to further extend the operation of the act entitled 'An act for the temporary relief of water users on irrigation projects constructed and operated under the reclamation law'", approved April 1, 1932, approved March 27, 1934, approved June 13, 1935; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. McGROARTY: A bill (H. R. 10752) to amend Public Law No. 383, Seventy-third Congress (48 Stat. L. 984), relating to Indians, by exempting from the provisions of such act any Indians of California in the State of California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: A bill (H. R. 10753) to provide for the construction of a post office at Parsons, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COLLINS: A bill (H. R. 10754) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make an engineering survey of conditions in the Palo Verde Valley and Cibola Valley on the Colorado River in California and Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10755) to provide for an engineering survey by the Secretary of the Interior of certain lands of the Colorado River Indian Reservation in California and Arizona; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: A bill (H. R. 10756) to provide for the issuance of permanent contracts to all contractors and subcontractors on star routes, compensation thereon, establishing a preferred list covering former contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 10757) to increase agricultural purchasing power and provide for the payment of tariff-equivalent benefits on that part of the production of certain farm commodities which is consumed within the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 10758) to provide for the construction of a Government building at State College, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ZIONCHECK: A bill (H. R. 10759) to amend the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, with reference to the employment of labor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BEITER: A bill (H. R. 10760) to provide Braille medals for ex-service men who are blind as the result of injuries in action; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McSWAIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 10761) for the relief of the present leader of the Army Band; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 10762) to authorize the procurement, without advertising, of certain War Depart-

ment property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 10763) to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to amend the National Defense Act", approved May 28, 1928; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGHAN: A bill (H. R. 10764) to amend section 15 of the act of Congress of August 31, 1935, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to improve the navigability and to provide for the flood control of the Tennessee River; to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley; to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of said valley; to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes'"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10765) to amend section 15 of the act of Congress of August 30, 1935, entitled "An act to stabilize the bituminous coal mining industry and promote its interstate commerce; to provide for cooperative marketing of bituminous coal; to levy a tax on bituminous coal and provide for a draw-back under certain conditions; to declare the production, distribution, and use of bituminous coal to be affected with a national public interest; to conserve the bituminous-coal resources of the United States; to provide for the general welfare, and for other purposes; and providing penalties"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 10766) authorizing the Secretary of War to purchase lands for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions for national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 10767) to amend the act entitled "An act to safeguard the estates of veterans derived from payments of pension, compensation, emergency officers' retirement pay, and insurance, and for other purposes", approved August 12, 1935; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PATMAN: A bill (H. R. 10768) to provide that interest on bonds issued to veterans under the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, shall accrue and be payable for any period elapsing between the date of the bonds and the date of payment thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARNES: A bill (H. R. 10769) to protect World War disability pension and compensation awards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10770) to make World War disability and death compensation and pension awards permanent after 5 years from the awarding thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. UTTERBACK: A bill (H. R. 10771) granting pensions and increase of pensions to widows of certain sailors, soldiers, and marines of the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 10772) to amend the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926, to authorize the construction of buildings for post-office stations, branches, and garages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COLDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 476) declaring the birthday of Thomas Jefferson to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSBY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 477) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 478) authorizing the construction of lighting facilities and radio aids for the air route flown under air-mail contract no. 26 from Omaha, Nebr., via Sioux City, Iowa, and Sioux Falls,



S. Dak., to Bismarck, N. Dak., and Minneapolis, Minn., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, re Floyd Bennett Field Airport as an air-mail service station; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: A bill (H. R. 10773) for the relief of Gerlando Mirasola; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARRY: A bill (H. R. 10774) for the relief of Gladys E. Faughnan, guardian; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEAM: A bill (H. R. 10775) for the relief of Patrick Joseph O'Connor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 10776) for the relief of Thomas F. Cooney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ECKERT: A bill (H. R. 10777) for the relief of Marjorie M. Mills; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10778) for the relief of Willard Webster; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDMISTON: A bill (H. R. 10779) for the relief of Anise B. Dulaney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10780) for the relief of Sarah M. Waugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H. R. 10781) for the relief of Herman Pais; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HESS: A bill (H. R. 10782) for the relief of the heirs of Haym Salomon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNUTE HILL: A bill (H. R. 10783) granting a pension to Randall Krauss; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 10784) for the relief of William Thomas Genobles; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 10785) for the relief of John B. H. Waring; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 10786) granting an increase of pension to Minnie M. Darrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 10787) granting a pension to Mary E. Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 10788) granting a pension to Katrine Rautman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10789) for the relief of Frank Charles Robie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10790) for the relief of Martin DeVries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10791) granting a pension to Margaret Teed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10792) granting a pension to Peter Lafayette Turpin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 10793) for the relief of Jack Wade, Perry Shilton, Louie Hess, Owen Busch, and William W. McGregor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UTTERBACK: A bill (H. R. 10794) for the relief of Merton E. Bent; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9875. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of the members of the National Guard Association of the State of New York, requesting the enactment of legislation authorizing an allowance of \$35 per month for quarters to each enlisted man of the

United States Army detailed to duty with the National Guard as sergeant-instructor while on such duty, and that such payments and also any payments heretofore made for rental of quarters for such noncommissioned officers shall be considered as an allowance to the individual; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9876. Also, petition of the American Institute of Steel Construction, Asphalt Shingle and Roofing Industry, Brick Manufacturers Association of America, Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute, Metal Lath Manufacturers Association, Metal Window Institute, National Crushed Stone Association, National Door Manufacturers Association, National Electrical Manufacturers Association, National Federation of Builders Supply Association, National Lime Association, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, National Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Association, National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, National Sand and Gravel Association, National Slag Association, Portland Cement Association, and Structural Clay Products, Inc., urging the extension of title 1 of the National Housing Act for a period of 1 year to April 1, 1937; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9877. By Mr. COLDEN: Petition containing 40 names of inventors, asking that the Congress pass immediately legislation establishing an inventors' loan fund; to the Committee on Patents.

9878. Also, resolution adopted by the National Restaurant Association at its convention in Chicago, October 11, 1935, objecting to the continuance of Government competition with private enterprise in the operation of restaurants; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

9879. Also, resolution passed at the quarterly meeting of the board of directors of the Los Angeles County Farm Bureau, urging all who have the welfare of our country at heart to cooperate in the support of such legislation as is needed to make agricultural stabilization a permanent reality; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9880. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9881. By Mr. ENGEL: Petition of Roland W. Kelderhouse and others, of Glen Arbor, Mich., favoring legislation to extend existing star-route mail contracts and increasing the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9882. Also, petition of E. D. Voice and others, of Empire, Mich., favoring legislation to extend existing star-route mail contracts and increasing the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9883. Also, petition of Joseph A. Schwarz and others, of Leland, Mich., favoring legislation to extend existing star-route mail contracts and increasing the compensation thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9884. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the League for American Neutrality, New Haven, Conn., protesting against certain provisions of the neutrality bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9885. Also, petition of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers protesting against continuing the present policy of the Government with respect to imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9886. By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of numerous citizens of Washington County, State of Utah, and patrons of star route no. 69200, urging Congress to enact legislation at this session indefinitely extending all existing star-route contracts, and increasing the compensation therefor, so that it will be on a basis equal to the compensation paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9887. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Carbon and Emery Counties, State of Utah, and patrons of star route no. 69168, urging Congress to enact legislation at this session indefinitely extending all existing star-route contracts, and increasing the compensation therefor, so that it will



be on a basis equal to the compensation paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

9888. By Mr. TONRY: Memorial of the New York State Assembly, memorializing Congress to take appropriate steps for the establishment of an air-mail base at Floyd Bennett Airport in Brooklyn, New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 31, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pause in that name which is above every name in heaven and in earth. We thank Thee that Thou art mightier than human burdens, deeper than human grief, and vaster than human needs. Heavenly Father, how helpless we feel in the sight of suffering humanity. Give us grace to do unto others as we would have them do unto us; may our breasts be full of that charity which suffereth long and is kind. Vouchsafe Thine especial thought and wisdom to the Congress. Give light and clarity of judgment to any who may be in perplexity, patience to those whose trials continue, and courage to any who may be grievously tempted. Blessed Lord, lift us all to the higher planes of thought and life until we reach the sweet tablelands of the heavenly places. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial to the early settlers whose land grants embrace the site of the Federal City.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3398. An act to establish the Air Corps Technical School and to acquire certain land in the State of Colorado for use as a site for said Air Corps Technical School and as an aerial gunnery and bombing range for the Army Air Corps; and

S. J. Res. 196. Joint resolution to correct errors in the enrollment of Private Act No. 349, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 29, 1935, and to clarify the duties of the Comptroller General in connection with said act.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. NORBECK members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments", for the disposition of executive papers in the Smithsonian Institution.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of making an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to announce the arrival of another Democrat. Mrs. Shanley, the wife of my colleague, JAMES A. SHANLEY, gave birth to a son at New Haven last evening. The latest bulletin from the bedside is that both mother and baby are doing very well. Naturally, my colleague is in New Haven, and I re-

spectfully request that his absence be noted and that he be given permission to remain away as long as he feels like celebrating the event.

Furthermore, I feel that he should be congratulated, because the date of the new arrival coincides with the President's birthday. [Applause.]

### HISTORY OF THE PASSAGE OF H. R. 6995, PROVIDING FULL RESTORATION OF PENSIONS TO THE VETERANS OF THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address which I delivered before the National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans at San Antonio, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an address delivered by me before the Thirty-seventh Annual Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans at San Antonio, Tex., September 18, 1935, being the verbatim transcript as taken down by the official reporters of that great convention and published in the National Tribune, Washington, D. C., October 31, 1935.

The address is as follows:

Comrade Commander in Chief McCord, distinguished guests, officers of the United Spanish War Veterans, and my comrades, this is one of the happiest and proudest moments of my life, for it is indeed a great honor to have the happy privilege of addressing this magnificent national convention.

My memory of the Spanish-American War goes back to the time when I was a little boy and lived in the city of Chicago. I thought at that time that the war was a good thing, because I used to sell newspapers. I sold the Chicago Daily News, and, of course, as a result of the war I was able to sell more papers, and I was hoping it would last longer than it did. [Laughter.]

My parents took me down on Michigan Avenue when they had the great peace jubilee in Chicago, when the treaty of peace had been signed with Spain. My father held me in his arms, because I was a little chap then. There were a lot of people lined up on both sides of Michigan Avenue, where Grant Park is now, in Chicago, and I saw the returned veterans of the Spanish-American War march by. President McKinley was there in a carriage. I remember seeing Theodore Roosevelt in his Rough Rider's uniform. General Miles was there, Admiral Schley, Gen. Joe Wheeler, and, if I am not mistaken (I do not think I am), it seems to me that Admiral Hobson, who is here, was in the line of march there in Chicago that day. [Applause.] That occasion made a very deep impression upon my mind and my heart, and I have always remembered it.

I think one of the finest things that Shakespeare ever wrote was the line: "For justice, all groves a temple; all seasons, summer."

My friends, all we did down there in Congress in the last session, in passing H. R. 6995, was to try to do simple justice to the veterans of the Spanish-American War. [Applause.]

Those of us who serve in public life often receive more praise than we deserve, and sometimes we get more blame than we are entitled to. There is a popular story they tell down in the Capital about Senator ASHURST, of Arizona, a colleague of Senator MCGILL, of Kansas. The Senator has probably heard this story, but most of you probably have not. Last summer Senator ASHURST went back to Arizona, where he met an old friend of his. They met on the street. His friend greeted him and said to the Senator, "I am not going to vote for you this time." The Senator was rather surprised, and said, "Why are you not going to do it?"

He said, "I supported you last time, and I even contributed to your campaign and helped elect you, but during these years while these matters have been going on down in Washington I have lost my home in town, I have lost my house in the country, my bank has closed, and I haven't very much money."

The Senator, in pained surprise, said, "Well, you don't hold me responsible for all that, do you?"

His constituent said to him, "No; I do not; but you were there when it happened, and now I am against you." [Laughter.]

In talking about H. R. 6995, the most that Senator MCGILL and I can say is that we were down there in Washington when it happened. But I give the most credit for the passage of that law to you, and you, and you, the 150,000 members of the United Spanish War Veterans. [Applause.] It was the prestige and the influence and the numbers of the United Spanish War Veterans that caused that bill to be enacted into law and to be signed by the President of the United States. [Applause.] Don't fool yourselves about that. Also, it was because of the arduous labors of your splendid national legislative committee.

I agree with Chauncey M. Depew, who said one time that he would rather have taffy while he was living than epitaphy after he was dead. [Laughter.]